X
1261

op

$2.94 p.p.

S

Central BAPTIST
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

BY THE SAME WRITER

LANFRANC

A Study of his Life, Work and Writing

Oxford University Press. 12/6

The Times: "It is the merit of his presentation of facts that he causes them to make us look more deeply into the distant past."

Manchester Guardian: "The discussion of the forgeries relating to the Canterbury and York controversy is an important contribution to the literary history of the time."

The Scotsman: "An English life of Lanfranc was needed, and Mr. Macdonald has filled the gap in our historical literature."

The Quarterly Review: "The book is one of special interest and importance."

Church Times: "He has written a first-rate historical study."

TRADE, POLITICS AND CHRISTIANITY IN AFRICA AND THE EAST

With an Introduction by Sir Harry Johnston, G.C.M.G.

Longmans, Green & Co., Ltd. 6/–

The Nation: "He discusses with a common-sense realism and breadth of outlook that is as refreshing as it is rare all the principal problems . . ."

The Contemporary Review: "Here, indeed, is a broad, noble policy."

Church of England Newspaper: "One of the most interesting and informing volumes we have ever read . . . There is not a dull page in the book."

THE HOLY SPIRIT

With an Introduction by the Bishop of Liverpool

S.P.C.K. 3/6

The Guardian: "This book, which is eminently concise, lucid, and well documented . . . will be specially of help to theological students."

The Record: "He has certainly tackled an abstruse theological doctrine in an interesting, practical and scholarly manner."

BERENGAR AND THE REFORM OF SACRAMENTAL DOCTRINE

BERENGAR AND THE REFORM OF SACRAMENTAL DOCTRINE

BY THE

Rev. A. J. MACDONALD, D.D.

RECTOR OF S. DUNSTAN IN THE WEST WITH
S. THOMAS IN THE LIBERTY OF THE ROLLS.
FELLOW OF THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.
AUTHOR OF 'LANFRANC, HIS LIFE, WORK AND
WRITING' &C.

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
LONDON ◆ NEW YORK ◆ TORONTO
1930

LIBRARY
CENTRAL BAPTIST SEMINARY

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO. LTD.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.4
6 OLD COURT HOUSE STREET, CALCUTTA
53 NICOL ROAD, BOMBAY
36A MOUNT ROAD, MADRAS

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
55 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK
221 EAST 20TH STREET, CHICAGO
TREMONT TEMPLE, BOSTON
128–132 UNIVERSITY AVENUE, TORONTO

Made in Great Britain. All rights reserved.

922.244
B488
A113

PREFACE

This book has been my chief occupation since returning from India over three years ago. It was conceived while the biography of Lanfranc was being written, and the kindly reception of that work encouraged me to undertake this larger study, especially as the Dean of Winchester, in his review in *The Church of England Newspaper*, suggested that some such attempt should be made.

The Berengarian controversy, which the late Mr. W. H. Stevenson described as 'a morass,' has not hitherto been allowed the dimensions of a volume in English. The book is divided into two parts. The first part describes in detail the life and work of Berengar, and supplies in the footnotes a critical examination of the work of continental scholars. The history of modern Berengarian literature begins with Lessing's important discovery of the *De Sacra Cœna* in 1770, which was not printed until 1834, when the Vischers issued their edition under the general editorship of Neander. The next stage was marked by the publication of Berengar's letters by Sudendorf in 1850. In 1880 five more letters bearing on the controversy, discovered by Edmund Bishop in the British Museum, were printed in the *Görresgesellschaft Historisches Jahrbuch*. Schwabe published his penetrating inaugural lecture in 1887, and cleared up many points in the Angevine aspect of the controversy. He was criticised on some details by Loofs in the *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* of 1888. For example, he over-emphasised the relations of Berengar with the court of Anjou as Gfrörer had over-stressed the connection with Henry I of France in his elaborate *Allgemeine Kirchengeschichte* IV, Part I (1846). Yet Schwabe's study will remain a permanent contribution to the literature of the subject. The first and

48051

only complete account of the life and teaching of Berengar was published by Schnitzer in 1891. Between 1891 and 1895 appeared a number of valuable articles by Bröcking in various German periodicals, which are, however, open to criticism on some points. In French no noteworthy biography of Berengar has appeared, but a sympathetic examination of his teaching was made by Ébersolt in the *Revue d'histoire des religions* (1903). Since Schnitzer's book was written, the publication of the French cartularies has been greatly increased, and the cartularies have been used for the first time in the following work for details of Berengar's earlier career. I hope that I have removed the doubt created by Schwabe concerning Berengar's original connection with Tours.

The second part of the book is mainly doctrinal. It begins with a sketch of eucharistic theories from Caroling times to the eleventh century, leading on to an account of the teaching on both sides in the Berengarian dispute. The various contributions made by Berengar are treated in their chronological order, and are not merged together as in the works of previous writers. Then follows the history of eucharistic doctrine in the twelfth century, when medieval theory was developed by the orthodox writers in the era before the Fourth Lateran Council (1215). It is necessary to emphasise this point because in this country the opinion appears to exist in some quarters that Transubstantiation was not the recognised doctrine of the Church until the age of the systematists of the thirteenth century. But Thomas Aquinas was no more than the last exponent of a theory which had been clearly enunciated by Guitmund two centuries earlier. The book closes with a sketch of the influence of Berengarian teaching upon the English Church. For the doctrine involved in the controversy an indispensable work is Geiselmann's *Die Eucharistielehre der Vorscholastik* (Paderborn, 1926).

I have attempted to show that a strong Augustinian or Evangelical tradition existed all through the early Middle Ages until its defeat at Rome in 1079, when Berengar was finally condemned. In the present work the account begins approximately with the Caroling era, but I have traced the earlier influence of Augustine on eucharistic doctrine in a volume written by several contributors on the Evangelical doctrine of

Holy Communion from New Testament days to the present time, which will appear shortly. If the thesis is approved it follows that the Evangelical interpretation of eucharistic doctrine, put forth by the Reformed Churches, does not merely issue from Reformation times, it is no mere teaching of yesterday, but has a long and honourable history from the Apostles to Berengar. It is necessary to go behind the Reformation in order to trace adequately the venerable history of the Evangelical tradition, and when we do that we find it flourishing in the very centuries when Catholicism was in the making.

Although dealing with a controversial subject, effort has been made to avoid a polemical tone, and to avoid giving offence to the deep susceptibilities of those who hold other views. My obligation to Catholic writers, both ancient and modern, is made clear in the footnotes, and I hope that even when trenchant phraseology in defence of Berengar has seemed necessary, I may not have treated unfairly honoured names in the history of doctrine, and honourable figures in the history of medieval Christendom, particularly as my biography of Lanfranc was so kindly received by Catholic reviewers.

The bibliography will indicate the sources from which the new book is derived. It has been made as complete as possible in view of the abbreviated references in the footnotes. One statement in the bibliographies of Vernet (*Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, II, 1905, col. 742) and of Leclercq (Hefele–Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles* IV, Part II, 1911, p. 1042) needs correction. They both quote a work on Berengar by de Crozals, which does not seem to have been written. Certainly it cannot be traced by the librarians at the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris. De Crozals deals with Berengar in his *Lanfranc Archevêque de Cantorbéry* (1877), and this appears to be the work to which Vernet and Leclercq refer.

I cannot let this book go to press without acknowledging the kindness and encouragement received from Professor Whitney ever since I became his pupil in Cambridge over twenty years ago. Without this incentive it is doubtful whether my historical studies would have been maintained. I owe a similar debt to Dr. G. T. Lapsley of Trinity College. I have to thank

Archdeacon Lilley for the loan of Berengar's *De Sacra Cœna*, which is not very accessible and ought to be reprinted. He allowed me to retain his copy for several years, and the work has greatly benefited by constant reference to it. This book does not claim to be a complete history of the doctrine of the Eucharist or of the Liturgies in the period which it covers. Consequently, some matters have received only cursory treatment. Certain valuable suggestions made by two scholars were embodied after the type was set up, and Professor A. H. Hamilton's chapter in the *Cambridge Medieval History* (vol. vi. 1929) did not come into my hands until the work had gone to press. Professor Hamilton has written a clear and succinct account of medieval doctrine, although some minor historical details are not quite in order. I should like to thank Messrs. Longmans, Green and Co. not only for promptly accepting the work, but for their expedition in passing it through the press; and also the compositors and proof-readers of Messrs. Spottiswoode, Ballantyne and Co.

A. J. Macdonald.

May, 1930.

CONTENTS

PAGE
Preface vii

Part I

CHAPTER
I. Early Life 1
II. Scolasticus of Tours and Archdeacon of Angers 20
III. Outbreak of the Second Eucharistic Controversy 44
IV. The Council of Rome (1050) . . . 59
V. The Council of Vercelli 80
VI. The Council of Paris and Synod of Tours . 99
VII. Nicholas II and the Council of Rome (1059) 116
VIII. Changes in Anjou and Rome . . . 133
IX. Literary Warfare 155
X. Gregory VII and the Roman Councils (1078–79) 175
XI. Last Years at Tours 198

Part II

XII. Berengar and the Stream of Tradition . 227
XIII. Sources of Berengar's Teaching . . . 250
XIV. Berengar's Earliest Critics . . . 263

CHAPTER PAGE
XV. The 'Opusculum' and Lanfranc's Reply . 285
XVI. Berengar 'On the Holy Supper' . . 300
XVII. Anti-Dialectic Conservatives . . . 331
XVIII. Guitmund of Aversa 341
XIX. Berengar and the Formula of 1079 . . 357
XX. Realism in the Twelfth Century . . 364
XXI. Alger of Liège to Gregory of Bergamo . 379
XXII. The Systematists and the Fourth Lateran Council 399
XXIII. Berengar and the Church of England . 406
Bibliography 415
Index 431

BERENGAR AND THE REFORM OF SACRAMENTAL DOCTRINE

PART I

CHAPTER I

EARLY LIFE

In the first decade of the eleventh century two men were born on opposite sides of the Alps who were destined to become at first friends and then bitter enemies. They died within a year of each other. During his lifetime one of them exerted a remarkable influence on the Church in England, and if we cannot trace any such direct connection between the other and our own Church, yet he belonged to a school of interpretation of the doctrine of the Eucharist which, through one of its leaders, made a decisive impression upon the dogmatic system of the Church in England five centuries later. Lanfranc was born at Pavia, and sprang from a distinguished family associated with the law.[1] Berengar[2] was born probably at Tours,[3] and came from a family which had won distinction in the Church.

Berengar was a name famous among the Lombard kings of the tenth century.[4] It figures among the nobility of

---

[1] *Cf.* A. J. Macdonald, *Lanfranc*, p. 3 ff.

[2] Other forms of the name are Beorngar, Beringoer, Beringar, Beringer, Berngar, Berenger. *Cf.* W. G. Searle, *Onomasticon Anglo-Saxonicum* (1897), pp. 99, 105; Sudendorf, pp. 200, 204, 208, 210, 215, 217, etc.; Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 8.

[3] *Cf. infra*, p. 4 ff.

[4] Berengar I (916–924) appears in the list of Emperors. Berengar, Margrave of Ivrea, grandson of the Emperor Berengar, was King of Italy (950–961). He died in 966.

Brittany and Maine during the same period. Berengar, Count of Maine, died in 892.[1] Berengar, Count of Rennes, was instrumental in driving the Normans out of Brittany and in checking their advance to the south (890 and 939).[2] Rollo of Normandy took as his second wife Popa, a daughter of Berengar, Count of Bayeux,[3] and a Count of the same name witnessed a document in 958.[4] There is no evidence to indicate whether or not our Berengar was a descendant of one of these noble houses, but the name can be traced here and there among the charters down to the eleventh century. Berengar, a farmer, signed a document in 949[5] at Chartres, and another witness of the same name appears at Chartres about 1001.[6] In September 1005 Berengar, Archpriest[7] of Paris, signed a charter.[8] It is noteworthy that the name appears in three early documents drawn up near Tours. Berengar, the son of Adalbert, is mentioned in 804,[9] and two clerks named Berengar witnessed charters there in 859[10] and 997.[11] When we come to the time of our Berengar, although, in comparison with Angers, fewer cartularies of Tours have survived, those which remain contain signatures of several persons bearing the name. In three cartularies[12] from the great Abbey of Marmoutier, near that city, which mention the name ten times, one signature is probably that of our Berengar.[13] In the book of serfs of Marmoutier[14] at least four signatories bear this name, and of these two—if not three—were monks. The Cartulary of Cormery, a Touraine collection, records the name six times [1] in addition to those already noticed at that house; and at Noyers,[2] another abbey near Tours, we find two signatures.

---

[1] June 13. *Cf.* Buson and Ledru, *Actus Pontificum Cenomannis*, p. 340, correcting December 13 in the *Nécrologie-Obituaire de la Cathédrale du Mans*, p. 329. He signed a document June 13, 891 (*Gallia Christiana*, xiv. *Inst.* no. 37).

[2] Merlet, *La Chron. de Nantes*, pp. 67 n. 3, 91 n. 2.

[3] Morice, *Mémoires . . . preuves à la hist. de Bretagne*, i. (1742) 129.

[4] Lobineau, *Hist. de Bretagne*, ii. (1727) 82.

[5] Guérard, *Cart. S. Père de Chartres*, p. 37.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 91.

[7] Two deeds at Tours were signed by nine and twelve Archpriests respectively, in 1079 and 1102. *Cf.* Bourassé, *Cart. de Cormery*, pp. 88, 107.

[8] Guérard, *Cart. Notre Dame de Paris*, p. 315.

[9] Bourassé, *Cart. de Cormery*, p. 11.

[10] *Ibid.* p. 48.

[11] *Ibid.* p. 61.

[12] (*a*) Trémault, *Cart. de Marmoutier Vendomoise*, pp. 11, 56, 136, 238, 307. One of the witnesses may have been Dean of Chartres. He headed the signatories of another document in the same year (1065 ; *ibid.* p. 144). But *cf. infra*, p. 21 n. 1. (*b*) Métais, *Cart. Blesois Marmoutier*, pp. 32, 58, 60. (*c*) Mabille, *Cart. de Marmoutier Dunois*, pp. 48, 52. Some of these signatures may come from the same person.

[13] Trémault, p. 238 : 'Boringerius grammaticus.'

[14] *Cf. infra*, p. 21 n. 8.

Not all these signatures are those of ecclesiastics. They include the names of people belonging to different ranks of life. But their existence sufficiently confutes the conjecture of Schwabe, who, misled probably by the large number of signatures [3] bearing the name Berengar in the Angevine charters and by the superior authority of those collections,[4] suggested that our Berengar was born not at Tours but at Angers.[5] Although we have no cartularies from S. Martin and S. Julian at Tours on the one hand, and although, on the other, the number of cartularies which have survived at Angers is larger, yet the references to the name Berengar are not much less frequent in the Touraine charters, and it is significant that the Angevine collections do not record the name before the eleventh century. Moreover, the prevalence of the name at Marmoutier, Cormery, and Noyers suggests that it would not be missing from those of S. Martin and S. Julian if they had survived. If Schwabe was influenced by references to men of substance bearing the name Berengar in the Angevine charters,[6] such references can be matched in the Touraine charters.[1] Possibly he was also influenced by the many more undoubted references to our Berengar, as Archdeacon or Treasurer, or both, in the Angevine charters, testimony which is, however, counterbalanced by the absence of cartularies from S. Martin and S. Julian at Tours. But it is hardly probable that at Tours Berengar signed so many documents as at Angers, where the official rank of Senior Archdeacon and Cathedral Treasurer necessitated his signature constantly. In Normandy the name appears four times in the list of monks at Bec for the eleventh and twelfth centuries.[2]

---

[1] Bourassé, *Cart. de Cormery*, pp. 73, 87, 95, 109. In two cases two witnesses named Berengar signed the same charter.

[2] Chevalier, *Cart. de Noyers*, pp. 12, 383.

[3] Brousillon, *Cart. de S. Aubin d'Angers*, i. 54, 88, 196, 298, 338, 340, ii. 213 ('Berengarius Decanus,' but not the Dean of Chartres), 361, 362, 370, 394; Urseau, *Cart. noir d'Angers*, pp. 74, 181, 193; Lepelletier, *Breviculum S. Nicolai* (1616), p. 14; Métais, *Cart. de la Trin. de Vendôme*, i. 187, 322, 334; Métais, *Cart. Saintongeais de la Trin. de Vendôme*, p. 61; Marchegay, *Cart. du Ronceray*, pp. 8, 33, 118, 121, 246, 270, and notably 'Berengar de Molières,' a landowner (pp. 80, 81, 128). References to our Berengar are not included here.

[4] *Cf.* Halphen, *Comte d'Anjou*, Pref. xi. M. Halphen's object differs from ours; he estimated the charters as sources of historic fact. But inaccuracy in the record of contemporary or recent events does not invalidate the signatures.

[5] Schwabe, *Studien des zweiten Abendmahlstreits*, p. 7; *cf.* Bernold (Migne, 148, 1453b): 'Berengarius Andegavensis.'

[6] But Schwabe gives no indication that he used the cartularies. Several of them had not been published when Schwabe wrote. We find the signature of the eldest son of a knight (Métais, *Cart. de la Trin. de Vendôme*, i. 322); an esquire (Brousillon, *Cart. S. Aubin*, ii. 394); 'Berengar Pancevaldus,' a frequent benefactor to S. Aubin's (*ibid.* i. 338, 339,

Sufficient evidence has been collected to show that the name Berengar was widely represented not only in districts within reasonable distance of Tours,[3] but also in Tours itself or the immediate vicinity. The signatures in the Touraine charters of the eleventh century, and the names of people mentioned by them, amply justify the contemporaries of Berengar[4] and the chroniclers,[5] who alike report that

---

342, 343, 364, 446, ii. 28, 263); the 'Vicarius' of Angers (*ibid.* ii. 361); the father of Arembourg, benefactress of S. Maurice (Urseau, *Cart. noir*, p. 74); a seneschal (Marchegay, *Cart. du Ronceray*, p. 121); a knight (*ibid.* p. 8); Berengar, brother of Poncius (Marchegay, *Cart. S. Maur*, p. 384). In the *Cart. . . . de S. Laud d'Angers* (Planchenault) the name occurs twice at the beginning of the twelfth century (pp. 18, 103 f.). The former, 'Berengarius pincerna,' may have been a monk. The wife of a Berengar is also mentioned (p. 63 f.).

[1] Berengar major of Ligueil (Bourassé, *Cart. de Cormery*, p. 87); Berengar of Cormery (*ibid.* p. 73); Berengar de Nova Silvatica (Mabille, *Cart. Marmoutier Dunois*, p. 52); Berengar, son of Lisiardus (Métais, *Cart. Blesois Marmoutier*, p. 60); Berengar, son of Constantine of Ranay (Trémault, *Cart. de Marmoutier Vendomoise*, p. 136); Berengar de Lanceio (*ibid.* p. 11); a Procurator of Archembald (Chevalier, *Cart. Noyers*, p. 12); Berengar, son of Erviss Cabrun (*ibid.* p. 383). All these were men of substance at or near Tours.

[2] Porée, i. 632 (col. 3), 633 (2), 634 (2), 636 (1); all after the entry for Anselm on p. 631 (3).

[3] The signatures are numerous at Chartres (Guérard, *Cart. de S. Père de Chartres*, pp. 100, 102, 117 (the Dean), 156, 159, 167, 207, 243). If Schwabe's argument is allowed, as good a claim might be set up for Chartres as the birthplace of Berengar, especially as it would be supported by his connection with the cathedral school there.

[4] Theoduin, 'Epis. to Hen. I' (Migne, 146, 1439b), and Wolfelm, *Vita* (Pertz, *M.G.H.*, *SS.*, xii. 185), who describe him as 'Turonensis.'

[5] *Miracula de Sancto Nicolao*—Bibl. d'Evreux, MS. Lat. f. 96 (*cf.* Porée, *Hist. de l'Abbaye du Bec*, i. 69); Sigebert (*M.G.H.*, *SS.*, vi. 359); *Chron. S. Pet. Vivi. Senonensis* (Bouquet, xii. 279d) (all early twelfth century); William of Malmesbury, *G.R.*, p. 338 (mid-twelfth century)—all these sources have 'Turonensis'; the *Chron. Mellicensis* (Migne, 213, 978d), also twelfth century, has 'Berengarius Turonensis exortus.' On this source *cf.* E. Ettlinger, *Der sogar Anon. Mell.* (Karlsruhe, 1896).

Berengar came from Tours. In the absence of any support from the chroniclers and charters, apart from later signatures at Angers, the suggestion that he was born at Angers falls to the ground. This conclusion is confirmed by the fact that Berengar's uncle and brothers were both canons at Tours.[1]

Berengar was born at Tours soon after the year 1000 [2] and

Cf. edition of Marchegay and Mabille (*Chroniques des Églises d'Anjou*). The *Chron. Bercense* (Maan, p. 85) has 'Berengarius Turonis natum esse.'

[1] *Cf. infra*, p. 6.

[2] Rangeard, ii. 19, and Port, i. 318, give 997. Bach, *Dogmengeschichte*, i. 364 (probably following Baronius, *Annales Eccles.*, xi. (1609) 795a), Chevalier, *Répertoire des Sources*, col. 597, and Le Crozals, *Lanfranc*, p. 84, have 998. Stäudlin, ii. 7, gives end of tenth or beginning of eleventh century. Schwabe, p. 7, and Schnitzer, p. 1 n. 3, have approximately 1010. Most modern writers have decided for the opening years of the eleventh century. *Cf.* Hauck-Herzog, *Realencyklopädie*, ii. 607; Vernet, in *Dict. de Théol. Cath.* (Vacant and Mangenot), ii. 722. Oudin, *Comment. de Script. Eccles. Antiq.*, ii. 624, says that in 1028 he was ten or twelve years old.

(*a*) Probably the best clue is a letter of Drogo of Paris to Berengar (Sudendorf, 200; *cf.* 88). Drogo says that Berengar was not yet recognised by the world ('te scilicet a mundo ignorari'), a remark which he would hardly have made after 1040, when Berengar was the principal archdeacon at Angers (*cf. infra*, p. 39 f.) and was constantly witnessing charters. Drogo says that Berengar was no longer young ('nec aetas, que iam juventutum excessit'). He must therefore have been on the verge of forty when Drogo wrote shortly before 1040.

(*b*) Another clue is the Evreux MS., the *Miracula de Sancto Nicolao* (Porée, i. 69), which says that Lanfranc was Berengar's pupil for a time at Tours. Lanfranc left Italy after the end of 1036 (*cf.* Macdonald, *Lanfranc*, pp. 10, 43 n. 1) and probably went to Tours about 1037, before going on to Avranches. This source says that Lanfranc was attracted by Berengar's fame as a teacher, a reputation which a man less than thirty-five years of age is not likely to have gained. Porée does not credit this report of Lanfranc, but the document comes from the early twelfth century.

(*c*) The charter quoted by Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 9, refers to Berengar as Canon of Tours. It must be dated not later than 1031. But it is improbable that Berengar would have been made a member of the foundation by this date if he was not born till 1010.

(*d*) Guitmund, writing *c.* 1075, referred to him as old (Hurter, xxxviii. 112: 'nec tua senectute parceres'). The statement suggests 1005 as the latest date for his birth.

(*e*) In a letter written to Berengar in 1054, Frollant salutes Berengar as the 'beloved Master' (Migne, 143, 1369 f.; *cf. infra*, p. 117). Frollant was then Bishop of Senlis, and could hardly refer to anyone as 'Master' who was born much later than 1000.

These clues point to a year soon after 1000 as the date of Berengar's birth. *Cf.* Clerval, p. 77.

On the other hand—

(*a*) Sudendorf (p. 88), while dating Drogo's letter *c.* 1040, thinks Berengar was already an archdeacon ('als er schon Archidiaconus zu Angers war'), and Schwabe (p. 10) thinks that 'ignorari' means 'not understood' instead of 'not known,' and concludes that 'the letter need not have been belonged to a family of substance. His brother Hubald, a canon of S. Martin's, gave to the Abbey of Marmoutier, near Tours, an altar-frontal made of gold thread, a rich chasuble, and a large sum of money.[1] His uncle Walter, the Precentor of S. Martin's, was able to buy land.[2] The name Berengar does not once appear among the serfs at Marmoutier.[3] Berengar himself maintained a number of poor students, and although the income from his benefices may well have supplied the means, yet a letter to Cardinal Stephen at Rome shows that in later years he still possessed ample supplies at a time when his income from Angers had almost certainly ceased, and when that from Tours must have been small.[4] About

---

written by 1040,' as Sudendorf holds. Both conjectures would allow for the later date of his birth.

(*b*) In 1078 Berengar went to Rome, and if he was born soon after 1000 the journey might have been impossible for an aged man.

(*c*) When Fulbert died at Chartres (1028), Berengar appears to have been still a student there, and this is not probable if he was nearly thirty years of age.

But there is no justifiable reason why a man of nearly eighty years of age should not have made the journey to Rome. To those who survived middle age, the life of the cloister did not preclude a vigorous old age. Herluin, Abbot of Bec, and Lanfranc, contemporaries of Berengar, reached at least eighty years. Gregory VII did not consider a journey to Rome to be too severe for Lanfranc in 1082, when he was nearly eighty (Jaffé, *Mon. Greg.*, p. 494; Labbé dates this letter 1081). Again, the report of Berengar's presence at Chartres when Fulbert died comes from a secondary source, and obviously details a legend (Malmesbury, *G.R.*, p. 341; *cf.* Hélinand of Froidmont, Migne, 212, 947a), and, even if authentic, need not imply that he was still a student there. Berengar may well have returned when the great master was dying. If we could be sure that Berengar was in priest's orders when he returned to Chartres, and that a priest must have been thirty years of age, according to the ancient rule, we could, with more confidence, fix his birth before 1000. This consideration may lie behind the date given by Baronius and Chevalier, especially if they made use of a doubtful signature at Ronceray of 1028.

[1] Twelve thousand solidi. *Cf.* Salmon, *Recueil de Chroniques de Touraine*, p. 319. Hubald made the gifts 'ex propriis rebus.' The writer of this chronicle was the monk John of Marmoutier, who was born *c.* 1140 (*ibid.* p. xciii). Possibly the late date of this source accounts for the omission of this text by every modern writer, save Rangeard, ii. 19. Rangeard also says that Berengar's father was named Aubrey. I have not been able to trace this statement behind the *Hist. Litt. de la Fr.*, viii. 197. It is repeated by Pletteau, *Rev. hist. litt. et archéol. de l'Anjou*, 1874, tom. 13, p. 14.

[2] *Cf. infra*, p. 25.

[3] Salmon, *Livre des Serfs de Marmoutier*. The name appears among the monks and substantial laymen (*cf. supra*, p. 2 f). The force of this conjecture is weakened by the fact that names like Fulbert, Reginald, and Walter appear among the serfs.

[4] *Cf. infra*, p. 144.

the same time Pope Alexander II referred to his liberality in terms which suggest sources of income independent of his ecclesiastical offices.[1]

It is probable that Berengar received the rudiments of his education at the cathedral school of S. Martin's at Tours,[2] but we hear nothing of the young Berengar until he appears at the famous school at Chartres, where Fulbert was Scolasticus or Rector, when he was made Bishop of Chartres in 1006.[3] In the first half of the eleventh century the cathedral schools at the leading diocesan centres, together with the monasteries, were the chief places not only of academic education but of the elementary instruction of boys. They fulfilled the functions of both grammar school and university of later times. The cathedral schools dated from the days of the Merovings and were refounded in some cases by Charles the Great, who revived, even if he did not institute, the Royal School of the Palace, and placed it under the supervision of Alcuin of York in the year 782.[4] The location of the School of the Palace is not known, and it has been suggested that it followed the Emperor, together with the rest of the imperial suite.[5] If this were so, its scholars were given an admirable opportunity of studying contemporary affairs and learning something of the art and problems of statecraft. In 789 Charles issued general instructions to the bishops and abbots, urging them to found schools in which the sons of rich and poor alike were to receive instruction in the same class-rooms. These general *capitularia* were followed by letters issued to particular bishops or abbots,[1] with the result that famous schools were founded at Tours—where Alcuin taught—at Lyons and Orleans, at the abbeys of Fulda, Fontenelle, Corbey, and elsewhere.[2] Nor was primary education in the parishes overlooked. The Emperor commanded the clergy to open village schools.[3] Theodulf, Bishop of Orleans (808–821), attempted to organise schools in the parishes of his diocese,[4] and similar instructions were issued by Pope Eugenius II (824–827).[5]

---

[1] Bishop, p. 174.

[2] *Hist. Litt. de la France*, vii. 53; Schnitzer, p. 2; Ébersolt, p. 15; Clerval, p. 77. But it does not follow that Adam the Scolasticus and Reginald the Sub-Magister (Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 9), who held those offices about 1030, also held them when Berengar was a boy, as Schnitzer and Ébersolt conclude, although they may have done so, if the late date (1010) for his birth be accepted.

[3] C. Pfister, *De Fulberti Carnotensis Episcopi Vita, etc.*, p. 48. For Berengar's presence at Chartres, *cf.* Adelmann, 'Epis. to Berengar' (Heurtevent, *Durand of Troarn*, p. 287); *Chron. Mellicense* (Migne, 213, 979c); *Chron. S. Maxentii Pict.* (Marchegay and Mabille, p. 385). The last is a mid-twelfth-century source, but for the events of the eleventh century the writer had access to the *Annals of S. Aubin*, Angers, and to the chronicles of S. Maurice (Angers), Vendôme, and S. Florence (Saumur). *Cf.* Marchegay and Mabille, 'Introduction,' p. xxxiv f. Clerval, p. 77, conjectures that Berengar was at Chartres during 1020–25, from his twentieth to his twenty-fifth years, but he must have arrived before he was twenty, in order to be regarded as a scholar who received his education from Fulbert. Dubrueil-Chambardel, p. 37, gives 1020–30.

[4] Maitre, pp. 1–32 (but *cf.* Bass Mullinger, p. 130 ff., for a correction of Maitre's account); Ébersolt, p. 2; Hauréau, i. 7–16; Mullinger, p. 74; Rashdall, i. 28 ff.; Lane Poole, p. 14 ff.; Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat*, p. 7 n. 2.

[5] Mullinger, pp. 69, 105.

During the disturbances caused by the break-up of the Carolingian empire and the onset of the Northmen, the imperial scheme of education fell to pieces; but the monastic schools suffered more than the cathedral schools. In the time of Berengar the latter still flourished at Reims, Laon, Orleans, Poitiers, Angers, Tours, and Chartres, and beyond the borders of France at Trèves, Metz, Toul, Verdun, and Liège.[6] The mantle of the great teacher Gerbert of Reims [7] had fallen upon his pupil Fulbert, at Chartres. Under Fulbert's liberal regime the schools of Chartres heralded the proportions and influence of the later universities, institutions which, while presenting definite contrasts with the older educational establishments, yet derived their teaching system from the educational organisation of the cathedral schools, through the monastic schools, which displaced the latter in the second half of the eleventh century.[1]

---

[1] *Cf.* the letter of Charles to Archbishop Lull (?), written 768–800 (Dümmler, *Epistolae Karolini Ævi*, ii. 532). J. de Ghellinck (*Le Mouvement théologique du XII^e^ siècle*, p. 8 n. 2) suggests that this letter was sent to the Archbishop of Mainz. *Cf.* also the letter to Baugulf, Abbot of Fulda, written 780–800 (*M.G.H. Capitularia*, i. 78 f., 234 f.), for capitularies dated 803–805. De Ghellinck confuses his references on p. 13.

[2] Hauréau, i. 11; *cf.* p. 14 for the schools in the time of Charles' successors.

[3] *M.G.H. Capitularia*, i. 237 (date, *ante* 809).

[4] Migne, 105, 196, cap. xx.

[5] The letter is quoted at length by Hauréau, p. 15. *Cf.* de Ghellinck, p. 14, for similar instructions by Walter of Orleans, Atto of Basle, Régnion of Prium, Atto of Vercelli, and Burchard of Worms.

[6] Ébersolt, p. 2.

[7] K. Werner, *Gerbert von Aurillac* (1878).

At Chartres, in the days of Fulbert, all the arts and sciences known at that time were taught and studied. The foundation of medieval learning was the study of Latin grammar, and with rhetoric and dialectics this constituted the 'trivium,' leading on to geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, and music, the four subjects of the 'quadrivium.' The trivium and quadrivium formed the graduation course in arts and science of those days, and represent a classification of the famous seven liberal arts, drawn up by Martianus Capella, in the fifth century, which was handed on by Cassiodorus (480–575) and Alcuin (755–804).[2]

The study of grammar included composition in Latin prose and verse. Chartres was a great school of Latin poetry. In its library more poets than writers of prose were to be found. Of the secular poets, the works of Virgil, Ovid, Horace, Terence, Stacius, and Servius were in the catalogue, while the Christian poets were represented by Fortunatus, Sedulius, Arator, Prudentius, and Boethius. The secular prose writers included Livy, Valerius Maximus, Orosius, and Gregory of Tours.[3] In the making of verses the scholars of Chartres surpassed those of Fleury and Liège, and we possess many specimens of Fulbert's poems.[4] The ancient or classical metres were used as well as the rhymed and accented poetry of the Middle Ages.[5] The Christian poets of medieval days created a new glory for the old Latin tongue in the chiming rhythms composed for the singing churchmen of the cathedral and abbey choirs, and for the gleemen of the baron's hall. When these lyrics were set to the plain-song tones of the Gregorian school, they formed a body of music for male voices which has never been surpassed by the triumphs of later masters and doctors of music. Among the poets of

---

[1] Rashdall, i. 29. When the religious orders again came forward as the instructors of youth, in the time of the Mendicants, in the thirteenth century, they founded colleges and filled chairs in the universities, thus carrying on the tradition of the old Carolingian cathedral schools.

[2] Hauréau, i. 25. On the curriculum *cf.* Clerval, pp. 108–144, and Macdonald, p. 27, with references.

[3] Clerval, p. 110 ff.

[4] Raby, p. 260 ff.

[5] Clerval, p. 111.

Chartres no higher place was taken than that reached by Berengar.[1] One contemporary has described him as the leading poet of the age.[2] A splendid specimen of his Latin verse has survived in a noble appeal to the deity, written at the Council of Rome in 1078. The *Juste Judex, Jesu Christe*,[3] composed when contemplating the ordeal by fire, touches the highest flights of medieval poetry, and breathes the spirit of mysticism three centuries before the medieval mystics cast the gracious mantle of their gentle theology around the otherwise rigid corpus of medieval theological thought.

As a writer of Latin prose, Berengar does not take a high place. The broken, tortuous style of the *De Sacra Cœna*, and of most of his letters, indicates a mind so distraught by polemical animus or by urgency of business that the formal rules of composition were carelessly abandoned. Yet the beautiful letter to the hermits[4] shows that he was capable of writing prose which equalled the charm of his Latin verse.

The study of rhetoric, as a training for public speaking, was mainly occupied with the reading of Latin authors. Among the works read at Chartres were some of the writings of Cicero and Livy and Victorinus. Chartres produced good speakers, among them Everard, Herfast, Renaud of Angers, Arrald, and Fulbert himself, whose sermons survive.[5] But high distinction in this art was again reached by Berengar. Guitmund of Aversa, who was no friendly critic, was compelled to pay tribute to the effects of Berengar's eloquence upon his students in later years.[6]

The nature of the study of dialectics or logic deserves more attention because of the part played by dialectics in Berengar's treatment of the eucharistic question. An examination of the list of authors read, and of the method employed in the study of dialectics at Chartres, throws light not only upon the intellectual training of Berengar and upon the eucharistic controversy, but upon the early development of Scolasticism. No fewer than sixteen different treatises on dialectics were in use at Chartres in the eleventh century.[1] The list includes the 'Organon,' 'Categories,' and 'Interpretation' of Aristotle in Boethius' translations; and the 'Introduction' of Porphyry. Of the Commentaries, it included the 'Categories' wrongly attributed to Augustine, the 'Interpretation' of Apuleius, the 'Topica' of Cicero, the 'Differentia Topica' of Boethius, also the 'Categorical and Hypothetical Syllogisms' of Aristotle, recapitulated from the writings of Boethius, which formed the only access to these two works available at that time. Clerval remarks that the library could hardly have been richer in the works of preceding centuries on logic and the writings of Aristotle.[2]

---

[1] Clerval, p. 78. *Cf.* Raby, p. 263 f.

[2] Hildebert of Tours in Berengar's epitaph (De Roye, *Vita, haeresis et poenitentia Berengarii*, p. 82 f. *Cf.* Migne, 171, 1396f.).

[3] Martène and Durand, iv. 115 f. *Cf.* F. J. Mone, i. 359 f.; C. Blume and G. M. Dreves, i. 176; Ébersolt, p. 153. *Cf. infra*, p. 187 f.

[4] Martène and Durand, i. 191 ff. *Cf. infra*, p. 204 ff. Neander, vii. 311, fairly eulogises the style of this letter, but it is curious that Neander, who was the general editor of the Vischers' edition of Berengar's *De Sacra Cœna*, should devote the same praise to Berengar's style generally.

[5] Clerval, p. 114 f.

[6] Hurter, xxxviii. 6 f.

For the application of logic to systems and ideas, it is not certain whether they had Chalcidius' translation of the 'Timaeus' of Plato, but Fulbert said that Plato was superior to all the writers of antiquity,[3] and Berengar referred to him as the gem of philosophy.[4] Neo-Platonists like Dionysius the Areopagite, John Scotus Erigena—the translator of Dionysius—and Boethius ('Consolations') were sympathetically read. Commentaries on the old works on logic were written, and glosses were inserted in the texts. The synoptic tables of Cicero and Themistius were in use. Clerval complains that the study of the rules of reasoning and of the forms of thought at Chartres did not result in the production of great theories and systems.[5] But he goes on to claim, in somewhat contradictory fashion, that Nominalism originated at Chartres during this era, and that its founder was John the Sophist, the physician of Henry I of France, who was at Chartres 1037–45.[6] The conclusion depends on the interpretation of the term.

---

[1] MS. 100, Bibliothèque de Chartres, quoted by Clerval, p. 117.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] Clerval, p. 118, quoting Pfister, *De Fulberti Vita*, p. 34.

[4] *De Sacra Cœna*, p. 61.

[5] Clerval, p. 118.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 123 f.; *cf.* p. 120: 'Rien n'est plus vraisemblable que cette origine chartraine du Nominalisme.' He corrects Hauréau (*ibid.* p. 122 f.), who attributed the origin of Nominalism to John the Scot. Hauréau confused John the Scot with John the Sophist, or the Physician, a

If Nominalism means the application of Aristotelean logic to the classification of ideas, then the date of its origin might be put back to the time of John the Scot. If, on the other hand, it means the criticism of universals, then even Clerval dates its origin too early, for that discussion did not arise until the twelfth century.[1] Clerval states that Chartres was Aristotelean in method and Platonist in spirit and ideas. But even this description appears to be too sharply outlined. The day had not yet come when medieval teachers could be classified into schools or even methods of thought, although divergence of thought was beginning to appear, and we may agree with Clerval that at Chartres this was indeed already apparent, some were inclined to follow the spiritual and idealist tendencies of Plato, while others followed the critical and scientific method of Aristotle.[2] But both tendencies were at work in the same individuals, and any distinction which existed was rather one of stress, or emphasis, than an undeviating pursuit of either method of thought. Scholars of Chartres, and critics of Berengar like Adelmann,[3] Hugh of Langres,[4] and even Fulbert[5] himself, who can be claimed more decisively as disciples of Plato rather than Aristotle, were not without resort to the dialectical method, when, in defence of their position, they distinguished between the senses, reason, and faith, and we shall see that Berengar, who deliberately set up reason against the authority of mere tradition as the final standard of criticism in matters of dogma, none the less remained under the influence of Platonism.

But at Chartres, at the beginning of the eleventh century,

---

contemporary of Roscelin, i. 244 ff.; *cf.* p. 170 ff. Hauréau based his identification on Du Boulay, i. 442. Von Prantl, ii. (1885) 22–36, also assigns the foundation of Nominalism to John the Scot, and is followed by Lane-Poole, pp. 281, 290 f. Endres, in *Beiträge zur Gesch. der Philos. des Mittelalters*, xvii. 131 ff., assigns it to the time of Roscelin. *Cf.* the *Cam. Med. Hist.*, v. 795 ff. *Cf. infra*, p. 312, n. 6. Dubrueil-Chambardel, p. 116, wrongly says that Clerval, on p. 120, places John the Physician at Chartres with Berengar. On p. 123 Clerval clearly places John at Chartres 1037–45, after the time of Berengar there.

[1] Cf. *Camb. Med. Hist.*, v. 785; Reiners, in *Beiträge zur Gesch. der Philos. des Mittelalters*, viii. 5 ff.

[2] Clerval, p. 118.

[3] 'Epis. to Berengar' (Heurtevent, p. 294 ff.).

[4] 'Epis. to Berengar' (Migne, 142, 1327a–b).

[5] 'Epis. to Adeodatus' (Migne, 141, 196d–197a); 'Epis. to Abbo' (*ibid.* 191c).

a revival of interest had indeed taken place in the study of dialectics or logic, and here Berengar received his earliest training in the use of rational methods of thought, so far as they were then understood. Such studies, undertaken by a mind naturally inclined to a critical view of life and ideas, were bound to be followed by tangible results later on. With justification Clerval says that the schools of Chartres did not produce new ideas during this epoch, but that statement must be supplemented by the provision that after he had left Chartres, Berengar brought a new method of interpretation to bear upon the doctrine of the Eucharist, based on ideas which were assisted in their formulation by the training received in the dialectical studies at Chartres.

There is no evidence that Greek was taught at Chartres, although it was being taught at Reims by Gerbert, when Fulbert was a scholar there, and Fulbert's writings indicate some knowledge of that language.[1] Sigon of Saumur, a contemporary of Berengar at Chartres, collated Biblical texts with the Greek original, and Hildegaire, another alumnus of Chartres, used Greek words in his medical writings.[2] But Greek was not included in the regular curriculum of the trivium in the Middle Ages.

In the quadrivium the studies of arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music supplied the merest smattering of scientific knowledge, and, with the exception of geometry, the instruction given in these subjects was completely lacking in scientific method. Arithmetic included the use of the abacus. Geometry was largely occupied with discussions on the properties of angles. Astronomy comprised the computation of the Ides, Nones, and Kalends, and the details of the Christian Calendar, together with a study of the movements of the stars.[3] Strange notions were prevalent concerning the movement of the heavenly bodies. Adelmann, the Chartrain, complained in later years to Berengar of those astronomers who taught that the sky and stars stood still while the earth passed through them with a rapid, whirling motion, and also of those who held that the heavens moved while the earth remained stationary. The latter, said Adelmann, were like sailors, to whom the towers and trees, and the shore itself, appeared to recede into the distance as the ship moved.[1]

---

[1] Migne, 141, 296b.

[2] Clerval, p. 110.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 124 f., but *cf.* Porée, i. 98 ff., for a somewhat different account of the quadrivium.

Chartres had a fine school of music. Sigon, who excelled in painting and the illumination of manuscripts,[2] was a proficient organist. Liturgical chants were composed by Fulbert, Sigon the painter, Arnulf, Angelran, Ralph Mala Corona, Adelmann, Hildegaire the physician, Sigon of Saumur, the Greek student, Olbert of Gembloux, and others. Fulbert's themes have been woven into the three Responds of the Nativity, the Antiphonary of Paris, the Office of the Benedictines of Solesme, the Office for S. Giles, and other music still to be found in the Missals. Arnulf drew up the Office of S. Evroul.[3]

The higher studies included law, medicine, and theology, or patristics, with special reference to liturgiology.[4] The study of law covered both civil and canon law,[5] although the latter was still in its infancy. The most famous medical school of the day existed at Salerno,[6] but on this side of the Alps an efficient medical school was to be found in the first half of the eleventh century at Chartres, where the principles of Hippocrates, Galen, Sorin, and Oribase were taught. Here Hildegaire, the musician and writer of medical books, was trained, also Guizo, Goisbert, and Ralph Mala Corona, another musician. Once more we find Fulbert's name among those mentioned, and medicine was one of the many subjects professed by that accomplished teacher.[7] So also, among his varied achievements, Berengar counted proficiency in medicine,[8] and so well known was his medical skill, that it has been suggested that, after leaving Chartres, Berengar adopted, for a time, the practice of medicine at Tours.[9] Of this we have no evidence, but his friend Drogo, writing from

---

[1] Heurtevent, p. 290.

[2] Merlet and Clerval, *Un Manuscrit chartrain du XI^e^ siècle*, p. 49 ff.

[3] Clerval, p. 128.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 142.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 141.

[6] Rashdall, i. 75 ff.

[7] Clerval, pp. 108, 129 f.; Dubrueil-Chambardel, p. 1 ff.

[8] Dubrueil-Chambardel, pp. 9, 11.

[9] Delarc, *Revue des Questions hist.*, xx. 119; *Un Pape Alsacien*, p. 273.

Paris about 1040, refers to his medical knowledge 'which excelled that of professed physicians,'[1] and Guitmund makes reference to his knowledge of medicine.[2]

Evidence of the range of theological teaching at Chartres is to be found in the names of the Fathers quoted in Fulbert's writings. The Greek Fathers do not appear, but of the Latin Fathers we find Cyprian, Hilary, Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, Gregory, Fulgentius, Bede, Rabanus Maurus, and Bacharius, a commentator on the lives of the saints. Fulbert discarded the allegorical interpretation for the literal and historical. He trained his students to trace a statement back to the scriptural text and to read that many times. After ascertaining the literal sense, he emphasised its moral application and psychological import. Reasoning was used rather for exegetical purposes than for demonstration.[3] Here is revealed a combination of old and new methods characteristic of the study of dialectics at Chartres, a mode of treating Scripture which Berengar used in later days. Again and again he attempted to tie Lanfranc down to a literal interpretation of a disputed passage, and this method was learned at Chartres under Fulbert.

In this glowing academic cathedral centre, occupied by studies so varied, and surrounded by friends so accomplished, Berengar passed the golden years of youth, winning success in poetry and medicine and in the school of logic.[4] Among his fellow-students at Chartres, in addition to Adelmann, later Bishop of Brescia, Hildegaire, and Sigon, already mentioned, there were Lambert of Paris, Ralph and Englebert of Orleans, Rainald[5] of Tours, Gerbert or Walter the Burgundian, Gerard of Liège, Gilbert, Regimbald of Cologne, Odulf, and Alesta, all of whom are named in a satirical poem[6] which

---

[1] Sudendorf, p. 200: 'Ad hoc quis non miretur tuam in arte medendi, qua ipsis, qui se medicos profitentur, premines, excellentiam?'

[2] Hurter, xxxviii. 14 f.: 'Sicut tu ipse testaris, qui per artem medicinae ciborum naturas et hominum nosti.' *Cf. infra*, p. 29 f.

[3] Clerval, p. 131.

[4] Ébersolt, p. 18: 'À Chartres, Berengar fit une étude approfondie des textes,' a rather rhetorical estimate of his grammatical studies.

[5] Or Raimbaud.

[6] *Cf.* Clerval, p. 59 f., who gives the Copenhagen MS., printed by Havert and dated by him 1028–33, together with the Gembloux MS., printed by Martène and Durand, iv. 113 f., and Mabillon, *Vet. Analecta*,

Adelmann wrote at Liège and sent to Berengar, and which Berengar, in his reply, compared with the mouse brought forth by the mountains.[1] Hugh, later Bishop of Langres,[2] Ascelin, Arnulf, Ivo, later Chancellor and Dean of Chartres, Ingelran, and Rudolf of Liège [3] were also friends in this early period. They were days of happy memory in later years, days to which the older scholars looked back with a particular regard for Fulbert, their master. Adelmann, with whom Fulbert was 'a most sweet memory,'[4] wrote to Berengar from Germany:

> I have called thee my foster-brother, because of that most happy intimacy in which with you the younger I the elder lived so joyously in the academy at Chartres, under our venerable Socrates. It is more justifiable for us to boast of our intercourse with him than was possible for Plato, who gave thanks to Nature, in the days of his Socrates, that she had given birth to a man and not an animal. For indeed we have experienced the more holy life and more life-giving teaching of that catholic and most Christian man, and now we should hope to be helped by his prayers, in the presence of God. Not indeed must it be thought that we have forgotten how he always bore us as on the bosom of a mother, nor is the love of Christ, by which he embraced us as sons, dead with him. But doubtless, mindful of us and loving more fully than when he walked in the body of this death, he calls us to himself, by vows and quiet prayers, entreating us by virtue of that quiet evening conversation which he often had with us, in the garden next to the chapel, concerning that city which now, by the will of God, he possesses as a senator, and beseeching with tears, which sometimes burst forth as he talked with us, under the impulse of holy ardour, he exhorted that we might hasten thither with all zeal, going straight along the royal way, keeping watchfully in the footsteps of the holy Fathers, not turning forthwith to any side-track, or any new or deceitful path, lest we fall into snares or scandals. . . .[5]

---

i. (1675) 420 ff. The list of names differs slightly in the two MSS. That it was Adelmann's poem is proved by the last verse:

'Zelo vestri cor accensus numeris funebribus,
Adelmannus vos perornat his exequialibus,
Ter quaternos, quatersenis munis uno versibus.'

The metre is the same as that of Berengar's *Juste Judex* which, in turn, was that used by Fulbert.

[1] Martène and Durand, iv. 114e: 'Respondit Berengarius: Nascitur ridiculus mus.'

[2] *Hist. Litt.*, vii. 442.

[3] Clerval, p. 103; *cf.* p. 62 f.

[4] Heurtevent, p. 289: 'Suavissimam memoriam Fulberti.'

[5] *Ibid.* p. 287 f.

Thus did Fulbert endeavour to train the minds and souls of his pupils by kindly admonitions, springing from personal interest in them and friendly converse with them, reminding us of the methods used by Anselm at Bec.[1] In the light of this letter we may disregard the story of William of Malmesbury,[2] who records that when Fulbert lay dying and his pupils were standing around him, Fulbert noticed Berengar, who had probably come over from Tours, or may have been on his way back from Paris.[3] He ordered Berengar to go away, crying out that he could see a demon standing on him, beckoning the others with a blandishing gesture and persuasive tones to follow him. The tale was almost certainly invented after Berengar had been declared a heretic. It does no more than reflect the critical treatment offered by Berengar to some of Fulbert's teaching. That his attitude to Fulbert was consistently critical is disproved by his own statement, for in the *De Sacra Cœna* he made use of one of Fulbert's illustrations.[4] His enemy, Guitmund, reported that he had heard from contemporaries of Berengar at Chartres that, puffed up by conceit of mind, he cared not for the teaching of his master, regarded his fellow-students as of no consequence, and made light of the books used for grammatical studies.[5] Guitmund also charges him with neglecting the study of Scripture when he was a youth.[6] That these statements were spitefully made is clear, but they indicate that while a student at Chartres Berengar possessed sufficient independence of character and clearness of mind to be able to discuss the teaching of Fulbert, to maintain his own convictions against other scholars, and to criticise the text-books in use.[7] But such an attitude is characteristic of a bright and alert-minded youth who received his education in the stimulating atmosphere of a centre like Chartres, especially when a varied curriculum was supervised and partly taught by a kindly and sympathetic preceptor like Fulbert, who invited the friendship of his pupils. In such a setting and under such an influence the special traits of individuals have an opportunity of developing into useful talents, and this cannot be achieved by any system of education which crushes the critical faculty of the young.

---

[1] *Cf.* Macdonald, p. 177, with the references.

[2] *G.R.*, p. 341 ; *cf.* Higden, *Polychron.*, vii. 210.

[3] Du Boulay, i. 404 f., says that, after leaving Chartres, Berengar went to Paris (*cf. infra*, p. 24 n. 2), a conjecture which modern writers reject (*cf.* Schnitzer, p. 5 n. 4). Clerval, p. 77, says that he went straight to Angers after leaving Chartres.

[4] *De Sacra Cœna*, p. 98.

[5] Hurter, xxxviii. 6 : 'Is ergo juveniles . . . contemnebat.'

[6] *Ibid.* p. 7 : 'ille adhuc adolescens . . . nondum adeo intenderat.'

[7] *Cf. infra*, p. 30 f., and Novati, p. 710 f.

A curious incident is reported by Berengar,[1] which may refer to the period spent at Chartres. One day a student, who had only recently begun the study of grammar, and who had been reading about interjections in the text-book of the grammarian Donatus, heard the other boys asking to what part of speech 'only'[2] belonged. Various answers were given. He said that it was neither a noun nor an adverb, as some maintained. They contradicted him, and he undertook to prove his contention on condition that they gave him a reward if he was successful. They agreed, and he said that 'only' was an interjection, and, opening his book, he said 'Read that verse.' The verse was in a passage which he had heard from the master on the same day on the force of an interjection, and it had been shown that an interjection was a demonstrative *only*. 'So,' said the fool,[3] '"only" is an interjection,' and claimed his reward.

---

[1] *De Sacra Cœna*, p. 260.

[2] 'tantum.'

[3] *De Sacra Cœna*, p. 261 : 'stultus.'

Note on the Date of Fulbert's Death.

The date of Fulbert's death (April 10, 1028) was settled by Pfister, *De Fulberti Vita* (1885), p. 47, and by Merlet and Clerval, *Un Manuscrit chartrain du XI^e siècle* (1893), pp. 47 n. 2, 49 n. 3, 52 n. 2, 159. Yet some modern authorities still use the old date 1029, viz. Brucker, ii. 134 ; Schnitzer, p. 5 ; Ébersolt, p. 19 ; Chevalier, p. 1624 ; Vernet, *Dict. de Théologie Cath.*, v. 1217.

The conclusion in favour of 1028 is based on three early documents : (1) A codex in the Bibliothèque Municipale of S. Étienne, Reims, written 1026–28, and containing the necrology of S. Mary at Chartres, Fulbert's church. This manuscript is described at length by Merlet and Clerval (p. 1 ff. ; *cf.* Introduction, p. i). The entry of Fulbert's death on April 4, 1028, occurs on p. 159.

(2) Codex 14167 (Latin) in the Bibliothèque Nationale, a copy of the S. Étienne document dating from the middle of the eleventh century (Merlet and Clerval, pp. 50–53, with footnotes). It originally belonged to S. Père, at Chartres. Pfister attributed this document to Sigon, a pupil of Fulbert

(*De Fulberti Vita*, p. 2); this is disputed by Merlet and Clerval, p. 53 n. 2, but Sigon made the entry of Fulbert's death in the S. Étienne MS. (Merlet and Clerval, p. 159). There is some obscurity at the end of Pfister's first paragraph on p. 47. He also misquotes the MS. in the Bibliothèque Nat. as No. 14161. The number is 14167. No. 14161 is an extract from the Latin poets of Italy of the seventeenth century (*cf.* Delisle, *Inventaire des manuscrits Latins conserves à la Bibliothèque Nationale*, 1863–71, p. 130).

(3) Codex 1037 in the Bibliothèque Communale de Chartres, a twelfth-century (?) document, containing the obituary of S. Père de Chartres, gives the day of the month, but not the year of Fulbert's death (Merlet and Clerval, p. 49 n. 3).

The date, April 10, 1028, is confirmed by the *Chronicon Dol* (Bouquet, x. 323e), which fixes it by reporting an eclipse of the moon (*cf.* Pfister, p. 47). The dates for Fulbert in the *Cartulaire de Notre Dame de Chartres* (Lepinois and Merlet), i. 14 f., are quite wrong.

Later writers, on the assumption that the year began with Easter Day, could find no room for April 10 in 1028 (which year began on April 14 and ended on the following April 5 of our 1029), and so placed it in 1029 (Mabillon, *Annales*, iv. 351; Bouquet, x. 443, n. a; Samarthan, *Gallia Christiana*, viii. 1116; *Hist. Litt.*, vii. 265). The *Hist. Litt.* and Mabillon reckon the twenty-one years and a half of Fulbert's episcopate, given in his epitaph by Sigon, from 1007. Pfister (p. 48) shows that Fulbert's episcopate dates from 1006. But is he accurate in counting twenty years and eighteen months? Should it not be twenty years and twenty-three months? The solution of the difficulty, supplied by Pfister, lies in the fact that the civil year was reckoned from March 1 (*Études sur le règne de Robert le Pieux*, p. xxxviii).

The correct date is given by Schwabe, p. 7; Hauck-Herzog, vi. 310; and the *Camb. Med. Hist.* v. 3. Among earlier writers, Oudin, ii. 624 f., has 1028.

CHAPTER II

SCOLASTICUS OF TOURS AND ARCHDEACON OF ANGERS

We have seen from the cartularies that the name Berengar was widely used among the families of Touraine and Anjou in the eleventh century. It is also frequent among the clergy and monks who signed the numerous charters of the period. In most cases there are indications which point more or less decisively to the identification of our Berengar, but in many instances we cannot be sure that the Berengar, or 'B.,' who signs a charter or writes a letter was the Scolasticus of Tours and Archdeacon of Angers, although in some cases we can say definitely that he was not that personage.

It will be well to begin by noting those ecclesiastics who bore the name, but who can be definitely distinguished from our Berengar. The document signed by Berengar, the Archpriest, at Paris in 1005 [1] is much too early to cause any confusion with our Berengar.[2] At Chartres we can dis-

---

[1] *Cf. supra*, p. 2.

[2] Yet it may well have misled Du Boulay. *Cf. supra*, p. 17 n. 3. Du Boulay was almost certainly unaware of the existence of Drogo's letter to Berengar, which was not printed till 1850 (Sudendorf, p. 200). But Drogo's letter suggests a visit of Berengar to Paris. He writes on the terms of an intimate and affectionate friend. Where was this friendship cultivated ? A Count Drogo signed a charter at Paris, May 26, 1026 (Guérard, *Cart. de Notre Dame de Paris*, p. 327). Drogo, Berengar's correspondent, became Archdeacon at Paris, and the inference is that there was relationship between Count and Archdeacon, and that Berengar had made the acquaintance of the latter at Paris.

On the other hand, the name Drogo appears in the Chartrain charters in 1055 and 1060 (Guérard, *Cart. de S. Père de Chartres*, pp. 200, 201), and this may have been the 'Archidiacanus Vilcasini' who signed there before 1061 (*ibid.* p. 174). The name Droco or Drogo appears at Angers many times in the *Cartulaire du Ronceray* [Marchegay, iii. 22, 27, 62, 103, 140 f., 148, 154, 220 f., 239, 240 f., 252, 277 (Precentor)], and two bishops of the name signed at the Abbey of S. Bertin, S. Omer (Guérard, *Cart. de S. Bertin*, pp. 187, 194). But there were also Drogos at Tours. The signature appears in documents of *c.* 1054 and 1078 at Cormery [Bourassé, tinguish three ecclesiastics of the name—Berengar the Dean,[1] Berengar the monk,[2] and Berengar the clerk of the works at the building of S. Mary at Chartres, who died in 1050.[3] At the monasteries in and around Angers several inmates named Berengar can be traced.[4] At Tours the ecclesiastics of this name were not so numerous as the laymen. But a monk of Cormery, named Berengar, signed a document (1026–47),[5] and two more signatories, possibly monks, of the same name appear there (1070–1110).[6] At the great Abbey of Marmoutier, Berengar, the first Abbot of Notre-Dame de Coulombs, in the diocese of Chartres, was trained,[7] and the Cellarer, the Baker, and possibly another monk bore this name between 1032 and 1100.[8] A presbyter from S. Martin's at Tours signed a document at Holy Trinity, Vendôme, on May 21, 1060.[9]

Our Berengar can be first distinguished among the clergy

Cartulaire, pp. 81, 87 (presbyter)], and three times at Marmoutier (Salmon, *Livre des Serfs*, pp. 71, 100, 110). So that the friendship between Berengar and Drogo may equally well have been made at Chartres or Tours in earlier years.

[1] Berengar the Dean signed a charter in 1033 (Guérard, *Cart. de S. Père de Chartres*, p. 117) and twice at Marmoutier in 1065 (Trémault, *Cart. de Marmoutier Vendomoise*, p. 56). The 'Beringerius decanus' who signed at S. Aubin's, Angers, in 1072 (Brousillon, *Cart. de S. Aubin*, ii. 213) was not Dean of Chartres. Ingelran was then Dean of Chartres, and signs a document after Adrald, the Bishop of Chartres, in the first column of the signatories. 'Beringerius decanus' is described as being 'ex familia Sanctae Trinitatis' (*i.e.* of the Abbey of Holy Trinity, Vendôme), and signs last but one in the fifth column. The seven preceding signatures are those of the 'famuli.' (This does not mean servants or serfs; a community of monks was called a 'familia.') Possibly 'decanus' should be read as 'diaconus.' It would then refer to a Berengar who was only in deacon's orders, although he would hardly sign immediately after the bishop. It is strange that a dean of Holy Trinity, Vendôme, signs last but one in the fifth column. The last name is that of Ermenric, 'the presbyter.'

[2] Signed in 1060 and 1061, and was thus a contemporary of the Dean (Guérard, *Cart. de S. Père de Chartres*, pp. 156, 167).

[3] Merlet and Clerval, *Un Manuscrit chartrain*, pp. 127, 180.

[4] *Cf. infra*, p. 37 f.

[5] Bourassé, *Cart. de Cormery*, p. 73. [6] *Ibid.* p. 95.

[7] L. Merlet, *Hist. de l'Abbaye de N.-D. de Coulombs*, p. 8.

[8] Salmon, *Livre des Serfs*, pp. 27 (Cellarer), 47 (monk), 62, 66 (Cellarer and monk), 85, 87; Métais, *Cart. Blesois Marmoutier*, p. 32.

[9] Métais, *Cart. Trin. Vendôme*, i. 239. Two other references to Berengar the presbyter occur (i. 189, ii. 129), and one of them appears to have died *c.* 1075. A Johannes Beringerii was advocate and chaplain at S. Maurice, the cathedral church of Tours (Bourassé, *Martyrol. Usuardi*, p. 31. The date is uncertain. The Precentor Nicolaus Beringerius, p. 54, is referred to by Maan under the year 1275).

of S. Martin's in two texts from Tours and one from Anjou. The early twelfth-century 'Chronicon Abbatum Majoris Monasterii,' issuing from Marmoutier, and written probably by the monk John,[1] describes the gifts made to the abbey of Marmoutier by Hubald, the Canon of S. Martin's and brother of 'magister Berengar.'[2] This must be our Berengar, for no one else in the charters bears the title 'Magister,' meaning 'Scolasticus.' The first of two documents seen by Mabillon, but which are now lost, records a grant of land made to Berengar not later than 1031.[3] Again, in a charter at Marmoutier which cannot be dated later than 1032, the signature Berengar 'Grammaticus' appears among the S. Martin's clergy.[4] Whatever doubt may be attached to the first of Mabillon's charters, none can arise in the case of this document, so that Berengar was certainly back at Tours by 1032 at the latest.

The collegiate school at Tours, which dated back to the days of Gregory of Tours, was refounded by Alcuin in 796, when he retired from the Imperial School of the Palace.[5] For several years Alcuin taught in person, so that the traditions of the Carolingian educational system were laid down at that centre, although in the first half of the ninth century the curriculum seems to have been drawn up mainly to meet the needs of the cathedral choir and worship.[6] Yet the application made by Abbot Lupus to Amalric, one of the preceptors of S. Martin's, for the loan of a copy of Boethius on the Topics of Cicero,[7] shows that the classical tradition, in spite of the objection of Alcuin to the reading of Virgil,[1] was maintained. Certainly one great change was made at S. Martin's when, in the time of Abbot Frédégise[2] (820), like Alcuin, an Englishman, the collegiate foundation was secularised, although gradually. During his rule of S. Martin's the clergy were called either monks or canons in the documents, and they retained the designation of monks for some time. But in the fifth year of Louis the Pious (*c.* 818) they adopted the dress and manners of secular canons, although a testament of the same year still refers to S. Martin's as a monastery.[3] The three hundred monks were reduced to two hundred canons,[4] and were supervised by an abbot and a dean. About 832 Louis the Pious granted the right of free election of the abbot to the canons, with the proviso that if they could not agree upon a member of their own foundation, the right lapsed to the Emperor. But during the latter part of the ninth century not merely the right of appointment but the occupancy of the abbacy fell first to a member of the royal house and then to the King of France himself.[5] During the next century Tours maintained its reputation, and counted among its scholars Rabanus Maurus and Haymo of Halberstadt. The collegiate church of S. Martin's was rebuilt by Herveus, the Treasurer in 1001, and dedicated in 1015.[6]

---

[1] Salmon, *Chroniques de Touraine*, p. cv f. [2] *Ibid.* p. 319.

[3] *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 9. *Cf. infra*, p. 24 f.

[4] Trémault, *Cart. de Marmoutier Vendomoise*, p. 238. The same charter has the signature of Evrard, Abbot of Marmoutier until *c.* 1032. So that Berengar was Grammaticus at S. Martin's by that date. This charter is signed by Ulgrinus (Ulger ?) and Walter, whose names come before that of Berengar.

[5] Mabillon, *Annales*, ii. 320; Mullinger, p. 108 ff. On the work of Alcuin at S. Martin's, *cf.* Vaucelle, pp. 38 ff., 55 ff., 335 ff. He attempted, without success, to reform S. Martin's as a Benedictine abbey. But *cf.* Levillain (*Moyen Âge*, May–June 1909, p. 201 f.). S. Martin's was finally secularised by 806 (Vaucelle, p. 41 f.). On the organisation of S. Martin's, *cf.* Vaucelle, p. 44 ff.; Lognon, p. 19 f.; Levillain, p. 201 f.

[6] *Cf. infra*, p. 27 f. Levillain, p. 202, says that perpetual psalmody at S. Martin's dated from the time of Alcuin, and refuses Vaucelle's statement (p. 355) that it dates back to the end of the sixth century.

[7] Mabillon, *Annales*, ii. 669.

When Berengar returned to S. Martin's, probably after the death of Fulbert in 1028, in the days of Robert the King (996–1031), surnamed the Pious, the second of the name and the second Capetian King of France, Ulger[7] or Wulgrin was Dean; Sulpicius[8] was Treasurer; Walter, Berengar's uncle, was Precentor, and Adam was the Scolasticus or rector of the schools, with the priest Reginald as sub-master.[1]

---

[1] Vaucelle, p. 338 f.

[2] He left S. Martin's to become Abbot of S. Bertin (S. Omer) in 820 (Chevalier, i. 1588).

[3] Mabillon, *Annales*, ii. 450.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 451. Mabillon says that a twelfth-century document reported that 250 canons were instituted. But *cf.* Vaucelle, p. 33.

[5] Mabillon, ii. 451. *Cf. infra*, p. 72 n. 6.

[6] *Chron. Breve Andegavense* (Martène and Durand, iii. 1380c, 1381a).

[7] The father of several sons who obtained ecclesiastical preferment (*Gallia Christ.*, xiv. 174a).

[8] Supplicius (= Sulpicius ?), a native of *Abasiensis*, when Treasurer of S. Martin's, erected a new church at Verneuil, and caused Arnulf, Archbishop of Tours, to translate the bones of Bishop Baldus (Maan, p. 83, quoting an old Breviary of *Lucacense*).

These details are given in a charter of conveyance, recording a grant of land made by Walter the Precentor to his nephew Berengar. The date of the charter is February 7. The year is not given, but it cannot be later than 1031, the year when 'Robert the King' died.[2] By this charter Berengar

---

[1] Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 9.

[2] The date of this document was not later than 1031 when Robert the King died. Sudendorf, p. 67, dates it before 1027, and is followed by Schwabe, p. 7, who thinks that it refers to another Berengar. A misleading entry appears in the *Pancarte Noir* (Mabille, p. 350), and in the list of deans of S. Martin's drawn up by Vaucelle, p. 440, both of whom make Bovo or Bono Dean of S. Martin's 1024–29; *Gallia Christiana*, xiv. 174b, has 1021–35 for Bono in succession to Ulger. There is in existence a document signed by Bovo, 'Dean of S. Martin's,' Fulbert of Chartres, and Abbot Albert, among others (Guérard, *Cart. de S. Père de Chartres*, i. 106; *Gallia Christiana*, viii. 492). As Fulbert died in 1028, and Albert was Abbot of S. Julian, Tours (the signature cannot be that of Albert of Marmoutier 1034–64), by 1025, Ulger would have been displaced by Bovo then, and this document must have been drawn 1025–27 (a year or so before Fulbert's final illness), and Berengar must have been back at S. Martin's by that date. But in the well-known charter of the foundation of Holy Trinity, Vendôme, drawn on May 31, 1040, Bovo 'the Dean' and Geoffrey the 'Dean of S. Martin's' both sign (Métais, *Cart. card. Trin. de Vendôme*, i. 88, 91). Now Bovo signs 'a civitate Turone' which indicates that he was Dean, not of the collegiate church of S. Martin's, but of the cathedral church of S. Maurice at Tours. A similar expression is used in this charter of the cathedral clergy of Angers ('a civitate Andegavana,' *ibid.* p. 89). Moreover, when Geoffrey the Dean is described as a 'monasterio Sancti Martini,' the entry does not refer to the Abbey of Marmoutier, but to the Collegiale of S. Martin's. Further proof that Bovo was Dean of S. Maurice is supplied by the fact that Venilo (= Guanilo), who signs after him, among the clergy 'a civitate Turone,' is described as Archdeacon, an impossible designation for any but a member of the cathedral church. Moreover, on p. 90, Archbishop Arnulf mentions Bovo and Venilo 'qui nobiscum venerent' as 'clerici ecclesiae nostri' (*i.e.* of the cathedral of S. Maurice). The confusion arising from the charter of S. Père de Chartres is due to the fact that S. Maurice, Tours, was often called S. Martin's in early days, because of its original association with the saint, and this accounts for Bovo's designation in that document. It also accounts for Guanilo's designation as Treasurer 'Beati Martini' (Nobilleau-Chantelou, p. 27, and *Gall. Christ.*, xiv. 205d). Sammarthan's difficulty (*Gall. Christ.*, xiv. 174b) concerning the length of Josbert's tenure of office as Dean of S. Martin's, disappears when Bovo is removed from the S. Martin's list.

There is some evidence that Ulger was signing documents about 1030 or after. A charter which has been dated 1032–38 (Chevalier, *Cart. de Noyers*, p. 5) contains his signature, and as his sons were not signing charters till after 1050 (we have two entries for 1053 and 1059—Métais, *Cart. Trin. de Vendôme*, i. 177, 231; Marchegay, *Cart. du Ronceray*, pp. 31, 56, 195) he may well have signed Mabillon's document as late as 1031, and this will be our first reference to Berengar after his return to S. Martin's. If Bovo's signatures were relevant, then Berengar was back was made the possessor of four-thirteenths of arable land, and of three-thirteenths, which Walter had procured from Arnold of Lille.[1] The conveyance was made 'by the desire and consent'[2] of the brothers of S. Martin's. Was this a private conveyance, witnessed by the members of the community, or was it the official grant to Berengar of the temporalities of his prebend?[3] On the one hand, the reference to additional land purchased by Walter from Arnold suggests a private transaction in order to create a prebend for Berengar. Another instance of this method of creating a prebend had occurred at S. Martin's some years previously.[4] On the other hand, it is expressly stated that the grant was made by the will and consent of the brothers, and the form of the tenure was the *manu firma*, a life-interest or usufruct in return for an annual payment. Several instances of this kind of transaction carried out by cathedral and monastic foundations are mentioned by Du Cange,[5]

---

at Tours 1021–24, well before the death of Fulbert, and the early traditional date of Berengar's birth (998) would be feasible. The *Hist. Litt.*, viii. 198, dates his return before 1031; Rénaudin, p. 421, before 1030; Clerval, p. 78, after 1040. The approximate date of his return is 1028–31.

[1] 'quartus tredecim de terra arabili, et tres, quas comparavit de Ernaldo de Insula.'

[2] 'ex voluntate et consensu fratrum.'

[3] *Hist. Litt.*, viii. 198, says cautiously that Walter's grant gave Berengar the status of a canon.

[4] *Cf. infra*, note 5 and p. 42, for a similar grant made by Berengar when Archdeacon of Angers.

[5] *Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis*, v. (1885), 239. An interesting record of this type of tenure, and also of the purchase of a prebend at S. Martin's appears in the *Cartulaire de Cormery* (Bourassé), p. 66 f. Ulger was then sub-Dean of S. Martin's, and the document was probably drawn up 1007–1025. A clerk named Letard Butericus held, by consent of the Abbot and monks of Cormery, the Church of S. Baldus for the life of one heir ('ad vitam unius haeredis') who was named Archembald Vindunellus. Later Letard wanted to buy a prebend at S. Martin's. Ulger agreed on condition that Letard handed over to him the Church of S. Baldus on the same tenure as Letard had held it. The monks of Cormery objected, but were informed that they had no voice in the matter until after the death of the heir, Archembald Vindunellus. The case is complicated because Ulger's son was also named Archembald, and he inherited the church on the death of Ulger. When that took place the monks of Cormery again challenged the arrangement, but failed to obtain satisfaction until after the death of the original heir, Archembald Vindunellus, son of Letard. When that occurred, they allowed Ulger's son to retain the church for life, on condition that he built another church, and promised to hand everything to the monastery at his death, and to keep the property cultivated. The last item was not fulfilled.

although he does not quote a case of such a grant made by a chapter to a member of its own foundation. The point must be left to legal historians, but it may be noticed that S. Martin's was a secular, not a regular, foundation, and that Walter, in addition to possessing certain independent rights, like the rest of the community, over his prebend,[1] may have retained, at that early date, sole control of his private property. It is difficult to account for the purchase of 'three-thirteenths,' unless Walter had a source of income independently of his canonry.[2]

Berengar's annual obligation amounted to a payment of thirty-two solidi to Walter, and in addition he had to say Mass at S. Martin's. In return he possessed the lands so long as he lived 'by that right which he (Walter) possessed them or would have possessed them.'[3] The property was situated in the 'pagus' of Tours, and was tithable by the Church of S. Épain,[4] whose glebe[5] was on the other side of the river *Esmancia*. The phraseology suggests that Berengar's property was on the Tours side of the river.

No office was vacant at S. Martin's when Berengar returned, and perhaps during this period he devoted special attention to the study and practice of medicine,[6] in which he acquired a reputation.[7] However, by 1032 at the latest, long before Mabillon's second charter was drawn,[8] he was teaching in the schools of S. Martin's with the title

---

[1] Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. ii. 9: 'sub sua auctoritate concesserunt.'

[2] We have seen that Hubald, Berengar's brother, owned private property (*cf. supra*, p. 6).

[3] Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. ii. 9: 'eo jure, quo ipse eas possidebat, vel possessurum erat quamdiu viveret.'

[4] *Ibid.*: 'in pago Turonico in potestate sancti Spani.'

[5] *Ibid.*: 'villa,' the manor or the glebe.

[6] Delarc, *Rev. des Questions hist.*, xx. 119; *Un Pape Alsacien*, p. 273. But Delarc suggests the curious reason that Berengar was not at first successful as a teacher at Tours. Then why was he made Scolasticus?

[7] *Cf. infra*, p. 32. Berengar refers to physicians in his letters. *Cf.* Sudendorf, p. 201: 'sicut nec medicus, quia medicus est curare frenesim suam.' *Ibid.* p. 224: 'Amicus et medicus in necessitate probantur.'

[8] *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 9. It concerns an agreement reached with some citizens of Tours over a piece of land. The reference to Radulf the Dean of S. Martin's fixes the document not earlier than 1063 (if we may follow the *Pancarte Noir*, p. 350). Vaucelle's earliest date for Radulf as dean is 1064 (*cf.* p. 440).

'Grammaticus,'[1] and shortly after, certainly long before 1040,[2] he was Scolasticus or Rector of the schools,[3] an office similar to that which had been held by Fulbert at Chartres. Before the time of Abbot Adalard (*c.* 840) fees were paid by all students who attended the school at Tours. This was regarded as an 'abominable practice' by Adalard, and in order to secure its abolition he handed over certain property, which included Amalric's prebend, to three canons, Amalric, Milo, and Guidard, on condition that no fees were accepted for instruction in the psalter, psalmody, and other things,[4] beyond payments which were freely offered. Amalric added to this benefaction, for we read that he left private property to S. Martin's on similar conditions, with the additional provision that it should be an endowment for his successors in the office of preceptor[5] in the school of S. Martin's.

---

[1] *Cf. supra*, p. 22 n. 4; *Chron. Turon.* (Bouq., xii. 461b): 'Berengarius grammaticus'; Bouq., xi. 349a: 'in grammatica clarissimus'; Sigebert (Migne, 160, 582b): 'Berengarius Turonensis liberalium artium peritia insignis'; *Chron.* of William Godellus (Bouq., xi. 284d): 'Berengarius tam famosus magister'; *Miracula de Sancto Nicolao* (Porée, *Hist. Abbaye du Bec*, i. 69): 'qui multos et prope omnes praecellebat scientia litterarum in illis partibus'; Balderich [of Dol (de Roye, p. 15 f.): 'Tota Latinorum facundia marcida floreat, Dum Berengario Turoni viguere Magistro.' Clerval, p. 77, says that Berengar began to make himself known after the death of Renaud, the Scolasticus of S. Julian at Tours, in 1033. The only connection of Berengar with S. Julian's on record was the discovery by Edmund Bishop of five letters concerning him which may have come from the library of S. Julian's (*Görresgesellschaft, Hist. Jahrbuch*, i. 273).

[2] When he signed a document at Holy Trinity (Métais, *Cart. Trin. de Vendôme*, i. 88, 91).

[3] Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. ii. 9. *Cf. supra*, p. 22 n. 4; Adelmann, 'Epis.' (Heurtevent, p. 287): 'Scholastico Berengario'; *Narratio Controversiae* (Bouq., xii. 460e); *Hist. Litt.*, viii. 198; Endres, in *Beiträge zur Gesch. der Philos. des Mittelalters*, xvii. 39, dates this appointment 1031. Vaucelle's lists are obviously fragmentary. He does not enter Berengar as Scolasticus and Treasurer till 1067 (p. 443). Dubrueil-Chambardel, p. 37, says that he began to teach at Tours in 1041, after becoming Archdeacon at Angers in 1040.

[4] 'Psalmis, notis, aliisque.' The curriculum at this early date appears to have been drawn up in order to train canons for the cathedral services.

[5] Mabillon, *Annales*, ii. 669. 'Scholae-Magister' may be equated with 'Scolasticus,' but whether 'Grammaticus' was another synonymous designation is not clear. Possibly at this early period 'Grammaticus' was used for any grammarian of note, whether he gave instruction or not. In later times it appears to be interchangeable with 'Scolasticus.' It is so in the twelfth-century reports of Berengar. Robert, *Les Écoles . . . du XIIe siècle* (1909), p. 32, attempts to distinguish between 'magister scholarum' or scolasticus, who held a 'licentia docendi' from the bishop, and 'magister scholae' or grammaticus, who was an assistant.

Both grants were confirmed by Charles the Bald in 845.[1] Thus, when Berengar became Scolasticus he was appointed to an office of assured dignity and profit, and some time later also assumed the office of Chancellor at S. Martin's. At Chartres the Rector of the schools often signed charters as Chancellor,[2] and the two offices may have been combined at Tours. It is from the 'Chronicle of Tours' that we learn that Berengar became Chancellor of that church.[3]

All the writers of his own time, whether friendly or hostile, agree in paying tribute to Berengar's fame as a teacher of grammar and logic.[4] Under his influence Tours became one of the most important centres of classical learning in France. In his great work on the Sacrament, the *De Sacra Cœna*, he quotes Horace six times,[5] and other classical authors, without naming them, three times.[6] Elsewhere he quotes

---

[1] Mabillon, *Annales*, ii. 451, 669, where the grant of Adalard is included in the account of the events of 818. But Mabillon notes that both grants were confirmed by Charles the Bald in 845. Miss Deanesly (*Camb. Med. Hist.*, v. 776; cf. *Hist. of the Med. Ch.*, 1925, p. 132) dates Amalric's grant 843, without mentioning that of Adalard. The reconstructed *Pancarte Noir*, p. 339 (Mabille), gives Aug. 841 as the date of both grants. But the charters mentioned were not necessarily drawn at the same time. Mabillon appears to quote two originals drawn at different dates. (These early documents disappeared at S. Martin's, Tours, during the Revolution in 1793.) Vaucelle, p. 344 f., reverses the order of the grants, and makes Amalric's antedate that of Adalard.

It is doubtful whether at this early period there was, as Miss Deanesly says, a specific office of Scolasticus at Tours. Adalard's grant was made to Amalric, Milo, and Guichard (Mabillon, ii. 451), and Amalric made his grant on condition that 'idem Amalricus *simul*que Milo et Guichardus ad vitam eas haberent, *eorum*que successor, quicumque fuerit preceptor in schola sancti Martini.' But he appears to have contemplated the concentration of the functions of the office in one man. The organisation of the schools and chapters was only gradually evolved during this era.

Amalric became Dean of S. Martin's (Mabillon, *Annales*, ii. 658; *Gallia Christiana*, xiv. 171c), and died as Archbishop of Tours in 854 (Bouq., vii. 51a).

[2] Clerval, p. 145. At Angers the 'Grammaticus' was Chancellor. *Cf. infra*, p. 39.

[3] 'Camerarius' in *Chron. Tur.* (Bouq., xi. 349a, xii. 461b) under the date 1060; Salmon, *Chroniques de Touraine*, p. 123. The document is late (thirteenth century) and confuses Berengar's oath of 1079 with that of 1059 (p. 124). Schwabe, p. 10, accepts it with reserve. Schnitzer, p. 5 n. 4, sees no cause to doubt it. Ébersolt, p. 19 n. 2, refers to the confusion between the offices of Chancellor and Treasurer. In England, Camerarius = Chamberlain, and in Scotland, = Justiciar (Maigne d'Arnis, *Lexicon Manuale ad Script. Med. et Infim. Lat.*, p. 397).

[4] *Cf. supra*, p. 27 n. 1, but Guitmund (Hurter, xxxviii. 6 f.) tries to belittle his scholarship.

[5] *D.S.C.*, pp. 25, 27, 29, 33, 48, 260.

[6] *Ibid.* pp. 43, 63, 105.

Terence and Boethius[1] and another unnamed writer.[2] He refers to Plato,[3] Aristotle,[4] Socrates,[5] Cicero, Catiline, Laelius, Cethegus,[6] Brutus, Cato,[7] Seneca,[8] Prosper of Acquitaine,[9] and the Romans, Athenians, and Spartans.[10] If he gave his pupils a thorough grounding in the elements of grammar, and encouraged them to read widely in poetry and history, his teaching was not a mere slavish adherence to the methods of the older grammarians. The text-books of Priscian, Donatus, and Boethius were adapted to his own methods, so that he was charged with introducing novelties.[11] The correct pronunciation of Latin quantities which distinguished the boys who went out from Berengar's school gave such offence to some of the older and less educated monks that the unfortunate youths were beaten in the cloister.[12] That the pronunciation of Latin was defective at that time in France, we learn also from Lanfranc's experience.[13]

Berengar's knowledge of Church history was more minute than that of his contemporaries. He makes frequent reference to the dispute over the rebaptism of the 'lapsi' in the middle of the third century during the time of Agrippinus and Cyprian, bishops of Carthage.[14] He mentions Lucian, probably of Antioch;[15] the trial of Caecilian, Bishop of Carthage, at Rome (313) in the time of Pope Melchiades, and his acquittal by the Emperor Constantine (316).[16] He notices the exile of Pope Liberius, Hilary of Poitiers, and Dionysius of Milan during the Arian controversy.[17] At Tours also he appears to have taught the theory of medicine, although without practising it. Several of his pupils, William Firmat, Hugh the Physician, Sigon, and Baudry afterwards practised medicine, and Hildebert, like his master, taught the theory of medicine and wrote books on it.[1]

---

[1] Martène and Durand, iv. 104a. [2] *Ibid.* p. 104d. [3] *D.S.C.*, p. 61 f.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 100. [5] *Ibid.* p. 213. [6] *Ibid.* p. 214. [7] *Ibid.* p. 213.
[8] Martène and Durand, i. 192. [9] *D.S.C.*, p. 267. [10] *Ibid.* p. 271.

[11] Adelmann, 'Epis.' (Heurtevent, p. 302): 'Aiunt te novitatum captatorem, veteres accusare atque probatissimos scriptores artium exauctorare, adeo ut Priscianum, Donatum, Boethium prorsus contemnas, multaque eorum dicta, quae eruditorum omnium usu comprobante ad nos usque demanarunt opposita auctoritate tua evertere coneris. . . .'

Guitmund (Hurter, xxxviii. 6): 'novis saltem verborum interpretationibus quibus etiam nunc nimirium gaudet.'

[12] Adelmann, 'Epis.' (Heurtevent, p. 302): 'Juvenes quosdam qui ad nos descenderant, in claustris suis a praelatis eorum regulariter pulsatos esse, eo quod in lectionibus ecclesiasticiis accentus tuos insolenter usurperunt auresque fratrum aliter imbutas, inusitatis quorundam verborum prolatione offenderent.'

[13] Macdonald, pp. 22, 36. [14] *D.S.C.*, pp. 27, 34, 39, 44, 48, 58.
[15] *Ibid.* p. 183 f. Also Isicius, but has the MS. been correctly read?
[16] *Ibid.* p. 46. *Cf.* p. 34. [17] *Ibid.* pp. 55, 115.

Dialectical inquiry, so assiduously cultivated by him at Chartres, was one of the chief features of Berengar's paedagogic method at Tours.[2] His teaching was marked by unusual acuteness[3] and penetration of mind.[4] It was applied not only to the treatment of philosophy, but to the interpretation of Scripture and the Fathers.[5] He expounded the Psalms, the Epistles of S. Paul, and the Apocalypse in a new way, and his teaching was regarded as an innovation.[6] A commentary on the Song of Songs has been attributed to him, also a treatise on the Incarnation and a collection of Homilies, but they have not come to light.[7] For many years he appears to have avoided a close study of the New Testament doctrine of the Eucharist,[8] and this probably gave occasion for the report that his study of the Scriptures had been neglected,[1] and at a later period Tours was regarded as a centre where false teaching on the Eucharist was being given.[2] His students were taught to seek out rather the literal and rational than the allegorical meaning of Scripture, but not at the expense of the inward meaning of the text, and they acquired Berengar's independent method of interpretation, for he impressed himself upon them, not only by power of intellect and accuracy of scholarship, but by charm of utterance [3] and dignity of bearing.[4] While winning their hearts by these qualities, he did not throw away their respect by undue familiarity of intercourse; sufficient reserve of voice and behaviour was maintained to conserve the affection which he won.[5] The violent outbursts against Humbert and Lanfranc in his polemical works [6] provide no contradiction to the favourable reports of those who knew him intimately. When smarting under injustice, the pen of the graceful writer is often unable to avoid dipping itself in vitriol.

---

[1] Dubrueil-Chambardel, pp. 38 f., 76, 83 ff.; *Hist. Litt.*, vii. 54 (*cf.* Drogo's letter, *infra*, p. 32).

[2] *Vita S. Bruno Segnon.* (*Acta SS. Julii*, iv. 479): 'ille magistor in quaestionum conflictu nimis erat exercitatus'; Sigebert (Migne, 160, 582b): 'amplius dialecticae peritia insignis'; *Chron. S. Pet. Viv. Senon.* (Bouq., xii. 279d): 'admirabilis philosophus'; *Chron. Tur.* (Bouq., xi. 349a): 'in . . . philosophia clarissimus'; *Hist. de France* (Bouq., xi. 161c): 'inter sectatores divinae philosophiae celeberrimum habetur'; *Chron. Max.* (Mabille and Marchegay, p. 385): 'qui item Brunonem Remensem et alios heredes philosophiae reliquit.'

[3] Hugh of Langres (Migne, 142, 1326d): 'virorum acutissime'; Guitmund (Hurter, xxxviii. 6): 'neque enim homo ita acutus erat.'

[4] Ascelin, 'Epis.' (Migne, 150, 67a): 'O Deus, ubi est illa vivacitas, illa subtilitas, illa prudentia, quibus affatim pollere solebas'; 68c: 'praeclarum illud ingenium quod tibi Deus concessit.'

[5] Drogo, 'Epis.' (Sudendorf, p. 200): 'in intelligendis scriptis strenuissima vigilantia tua atque in illis exponendis . . . a perscrutacione scriptorum retrahunt nec impediunt.'

[6] Gozechin, 'Epis. to Walter' (Migne, 143, 900b); Higden, vii. 208. But the commentary on the Apocalypse is attributed by Oudin, ii. 105, to Berengose, Abbot of Trèves (d. 1125). Ceillier, xx. 301, assigns it to Berengar, a monk of Ferrières. It appears among the works of Ambrose (Migne, 17, 765 ff.).

[7] *Chron. Monte Casino* (quoted by Cellier, xx. 301).

[8] Berengar admitted in later years that the teaching of S. John on the Eucharist was new to him ('Epis. to Ansfroi,' Sudendorf, p. 209 f.). In the *De Sacra Cœna*, p. 44, he says that in 1050 'nondum tam diligenti in scripturis consideratione sategeram.' But when read in the light of Drogo's statements these charges probably refer to Scriptural teaching on the Eucharist only. All his letters and treatises are full of Scriptural quotations.

To charm of manner Berengar added goodness of heart and uprightness of life.[7] He was watchful against feminine attractions, he allowed no woman to come into his presence.[8] Like Bernard of Clairvaux he upheld the austere view that the eye could not be delighted without damage to the soul; perhaps a salutary attitude during an epoch of ill-regulated social relationships. Throughout the stormy years of the second half of his life, when friends were falling away and enemies were gathering in ever-growing numbers, no word of scandal was raised against the character of Berengar. This is the more remarkable because his liberality to the poor afforded an opportunity for malicious tongues which they were never able to use. Even the spiteful Guitmund has to confine his criticism to remarks which deal with mere superficial features of manner or behaviour.

---

[1] Guitmund (Hurter, p. 7) says that he did not begin to study Scripture until Lanfranc had drawn his pupils away to Bec. Pletteau, p. 161, adds that this began after Lanfranc had defeated Berengar in a discussion on grammar, before the scholars. His only authority can be Henry of Knighton. *Cf. infra*, p. 34 n. 7.

[2] Gozechin (Migne, 143, 900c).

[3] Drogo (Sudendorf, p. 200): 'commodissima et jocundissima eloquentia.' Even Guitmund, p. 10, refers to his 'dulces sermones.'

[4] Like most men in the Middle Ages, Berengar was not tall in stature. He was a little over five feet in height, but a large mouth indicates the public speaker (*cf. infra*, p. 209 f.).

[5] Guitmund (Hurter, p. 6): 'pompatico incessu, sublimi prae ceteris suggestu, . . . profunda quoque inclusione inter cucullum ac simulatione longae meditationis, et vix tandem satis desideratae diu vocis lentissimo quodam quasi plangore.' Guitmund wishes to imply that his bearing was bombastic and affected.

[6] *Cf. infra*, pp. 122, 164 ff.

[7] Adelmann (Heurtevent, p. 288): 'sancte frater'; *Chron. Sith.* (Bouq., xi. 382b): 'homo sanctus'; Hugh of Langres (Migne, 142, 1328b): 'in cunctis aliis reverendissime vir.'

[8] Malmesbury, *G.R.*, p. 339: 'femineae venustatis adeo parcus, ut nullam conspectui suo pateretur admitti ne formam videretur delibasse oculo quam non pruriebat animo.' This passage can hardly mean that he never looked at a woman. *Cf.* Higden, vii. 208.

If he was a man of austere life, his self-discipline did not hinder him from inspiring affectionate friendships. Drogo of Paris [1] was not a pupil of Berengar, but a letter written when the latter had been for a few years in charge of the schools at Tours may well be quoted in illustration of the influence exerted by the Scolasticus upon other people at this time. The letter was written shortly after Drogo had visited him at Tours.

> If I told you to your face how great was my admiration for your most strenuous care in apprehending the Scriptures, and your perfect and most happy eloquence in expounding them, I should seem to be a flatterer. But now that I am absent, lest by my silence I should appear to have an ordinary opinion of your excellence, I am glad to let you know by letter what I feel about you, since you hold in my estimation a unique and chief place. I can find no one to whom I can liken you. Neither the vast number of things you have to do in connection with your own affairs and in advising those who consult you, nor your age, which is no longer that of youth, nor your body which you afflict with much abstinence, withdraw or hinder you from a close scrutiny of the Scriptures so that you are prevented from understanding them, or grasping them clearly. Moreover, who does not admire your excellence in the medical art, in which you surpass those who are professed physicians? What more shall I say? One thing I mourn and deplore, that apparently you are unknown by the world, but I am partly consoled, because, since I left you, I have sung your praises, so far as possible, and to no obscure men.[2]

---

[1] On Drogo *cf.* Mullinger, p. 192.

[2] Sudendorf, p. 200; *cf.* p. 88 f. But Berengar was not yet Archdeacon as Sudendorf says. He dates the letter *c.* 1040. Delarc, *Revue des Questions hist.*, xx. 119, gives 1045.

During this period Berengar was consulted by another friend, Joscelin of Partenay, the Treasurer of the Cathedral of S. Hilary at Poitiers, on a dispute which seems to have arisen between Isembert,[1] Bishop of Poitiers, and some of his clergy. The details are made known by Berengar's reply.[2] After greeting his 'beloved brother Joscelin,' he points out that it would be rash not to examine the causes of the trouble.

The clergy have either a good case against the Bishop, or a bad one, or one which is partly good and partly bad. If their case is good the Bishop ought not to disguise the fact,[3] for it is the part of a bishop first to cast the beam or straw out of his own eye, which means, according to Scripture, hate and anger, for does not a doctor, since he is a doctor, cure his own sickness? If their case is bad, he ought to remember what the Apostle said to bishops, 'Not lording it over the clergy, but being examples to the flock,' so that for their satisfaction he may not appear inhumane because they are in the wrong, but humane, because he ought to be himself an example to them of charity and patience. Thus, having the desire he will not pretend the correction of them, but remain satisfied as God says that He is satisfied: 'Be ye converted and live.'[4] If they are partly justified, as appears to me to be the case, since they allege that he ought not to introduce anything into the church against their just desire (no prelate indeed, especially a bishop, may do anything in a church which he ought not to do); but also partly unjustified, for it seems that they were rash in going away from him in the chapter-house—he should be restrained so far as they were right, just as he is annoyed because they were wrong. He should remember that saying which, although it be poetical is not without point, 'Evil levels those whom it pollutes.' The gospel precept seems to apply to the case, 'They do not gather grapes from thorns.' So also let him first depart from all indignation, and then, so far as he can, by kindness urge that they also may recover their senses. It is the duty of all Christian prelates, much more of bishops, to do nothing with the desire of injuring, but all from a love of helping. If this is done the blessed Augustine prescribes that nothing be done unkindly, nothing inhumanly. For the rest, his excommunication of the deacon, because he has married a wife, appears to me to have been done against the canons.[1]

---

[1] Sudendorf, p. 91.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 200 f.; *cf.* p. 89 ff. Martène and Durand, i. 195c, think that the letter was addressed to Lanfranc. The *Hist. Litt.*, viii. 219, disagrees, and Sudendorf finally refutes the suggestion (p. 89).

[3] 'Simulare.' *Cf.* 'dissimulare,' a word frequently used by Berengar. Cf. *De Sacra Cœna*, pp. 50, 66, 68, 70, 82, 93, etc. The letter is written in characteristically argumentative style and can be confidently attributed to him.

[4] Isaiah xxi. 12. But the Vulgate has 'venite' instead of 'vivite.'

Students from all parts of France came to Tours during the first ten years of Berengar's work as Scolasticus.[2] Several of them reached high office and dignity in later life. Among them were Eusebius Bruno,[3] who became Bishop of Angers and gave Berengar his support during the first period of the eucharistic controversy; Hildebert, who became Bishop of Le Mans and then Archbishop of Tours, the writer of Berengar's epitaph;[4] Bruno the founder of the Carthusian order; possibly Robert of Landrecies and Hubert of Marmoutier;[5] possibly also Baudry of Bourgueil,[6] who wrote obituary verses on Berengar; and, for a short time, Lanfranc,[7] soon after his arrival from Italy, and before he began to lecture in the cathedral school of Avranches.

Among his scholars were a number of poor students, who were maintained by Berengar's liberality on such a scale as to suggest that the money did not come entirely or mainly from the revenues of ecclesiastical offices held by him.[8] Even so late as 1073 Berengar had access to ample funds.[1] In a letter sent to Geoffrey Barbatus, Count of Anjou, Pope Alexander II said that Berengar's alms-giving surpassed the munificence of most bishops.[2] When Gregory VII took him under his protection in 1079, the Pope referred to his possessions.[3] Hildebert, perhaps somewhat fulsomely, said that he impoverished himself to assist others.[4] He was a lover of the poor,[5] and his charity was disbursed in a 'lordly manner.'[6] So early as the dispute with Henry I of France, Berengar complained that the King had deprived him of a large sum of money.[7] We have seen that his uncle Walter was a man of substance. Walter probably died soon after Berengar returned to Tours, and then Berengar may have inherited family property.[8] His generosity to poor students was not allowed to pass unchallenged by his adversaries. Lanfranc accused him of bribery, in order to secure support for his heretical teaching,[9] and the charge was taken up by Guitmund[10] and Orderic.[11] It can, however, be entirely dismissed.[12]

---

[1] The concluding phrase in Martène and Durand, i. 196—'nisi forte cogente pertinacia'—is a later addition to the text (*cf.* Sudendorf, p. 92). Sudendorf dates the letter 1047–49, on the ground that Isembert was not Bishop of Poitiers before 1047, and because it must have been written before Berengar's teaching became well known (*c.* 1049), and before Leo IX's regulation against the married clergy in 1049. But Isembert was Bishop of Poitiers by 1040 (*cf. infra*, p. 39) and so the date should be 1040–1049. Delarc, *Rev. des Quest. hist.*, xx. 120, dates it *c.* 1048.

[2] Heurtevent, p. 125, says they were attracted by his novel teaching on the Eucharist, but this was impossible at that date.

[3] *Hist. Litt.*, viii. 99, or was not Eusebius rather a fellow-pupil of Berengar at Chartres? *Cf.* Ébersolt, p. 25.

[4] *Hist. Litt.*, vii. 64, but in xi. 251 doubts whether Hildebert was Berengar's pupil. This, however, is accepted by Hildebert's biographer, Hébert-Duperron, *De Venerabilis Hildeberti . . . Vita et Scriptis* (1885), p. 11, and Maan, p. 103.

[5] Mabillon, *Annales*, iv. 668.

[6] Dubrueil-Chambardel, p. 38.

[7] *Cf.* Macdonald, p. 10, and *infra*, p. 49 n. 4. Vernet (*Dict. de Théol. Cath.*, ii. 723) denies that Lanfranc attended this school. Henry of Knighton, i. 90, a late writer, refers to a disputation between Berengar and Lanfranc in the schools. Pfister, *De Fulberti Vita*, p. 47, places Berengar and Lanfranc together at Chartres. Novati, p. 712, denies this. Novati, p. 716, thinks the account of Henry of Knighton springs from Guitmund (*cf.* p. 711). But Guitmund's statement (Hurter, xxxviii. 7) hardly brings Lanfranc to Chartres when Berengar was 'adolescens' there. Clerval, p. 81, thinks that Henry of Knighton's report refers only to public disputations.

[8] *Cf. infra*, p. 144.

Not the least among the many puzzles by which his record is entangled is the date when Berengar established a relationship with Angers. Lessing doubted whether Berengar of

---

[1] Sudendorf, p. 225.

[2] Edmund Bishop, i. 274: 'tanta assiduitate elemosinarum pollere ut vix quivis episcopus aequari sibi possit.'

[3] Jaffé, *Mon. Greg.*, p. 550.

[4] Malmesbury, *G.R.*, p. 340: 'Qui non cessavit inopum fulcire ruinas Donec inops dando pauper et ipse fuit.' *Cf.* Higden, vii. 208.

[5] Clarius (Bouq., xii. 279d): 'amator pauperum.'

[6] Malmesbury, *G.R.*, p. 339: 'largarum possessionum dispertiendo dominus.'

[7] Berengar, 'Epis. to Richard' (Sudendorf, p. 211): 'compensaret dampnum, quod mihi . . . tantum intulit.'

[8] Schwabe, p. 8 f., attributes his wealth to private possessions and the revenues of his archdeaconry. Gfrörer (*Allgemeine Kirchengeschichte*, iv. pt. i. 548; *Greg. VII*, vi. 614) says that the money given by Berengar to his students was paid by Henry I for propaganda purposes. *Cf.* Will, i. 74 n. 26. Schwabe unfairly charges Gfrörer and Will with representing Berengar as a poor man.

[9] *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini* (Migne, 150, 436a): 'discipuli atque sequaces tui, subversores quidem aliorem et ipsi auro et argento caeteraque pecunia tua a te subversi.'

[10] Hurter, xxxviii. 10: 'per egenos scholasticos jam alimoniam, qua sustentabat eos . . . corruptos.'

[11] Le Prévost, ii. 11.

[12] *Cf.* Heurtevent, p. 126 n. 3: 'l'interprétation malveillante . . . est certainement tendancieuse.'

Tours was also Archdeacon of Angers.[1] The modern scholar Schwabe, who vigorously contended for the connection with Angers, maintained that Berengar was not necessarily born at Tours, but rather at Angers, and he declined to admit that Walter's grant of land was made to our Berengar.[2] But most of the evidence shows conclusively that Berengar the Scolasticus and Chancellor of Tours was also Archdeacon of Angers.[3]

---

[1] *Berengarius Turonensis*, p. 155 f. In support of Lessing's view it is to be observed that in several important sources Berengar does not appear as 'Archdeacon.' Berengar speaks of himself as 'clericus' of S. Martin's (*D.S.C.*, p. 42), and refers to another as 'concanonicus mihi . . . in ecclesia beati Martini' (*ibid.* p. 46). The oath of 1079 is described as that of 'Berengarii Turonensis presbyter' (Jaffé, *Mon. Greg.*, p. 353). In the *Narratio Controversiae* (Bouq., xii. 460e) he appears as 'Scholae Magister'; in the *Chron. Maxentii* (Mabille and Marchegay, p. 385): 'canonicus Sancti Martini'; in the 'Epis. of Euseb.' (Sudendorf, p. 204): 'ecclesiae nostrae clericum Berengar'; in the letter of Alex. II (Bishop, Ep. i.): 'venerabili presbytero.' If the latter epistle was sent to another Berengar, the difficulty of the Pope's cordial tone to a heretic would be removed. The letters of Eusebius and of Berengar to Cardinal Stephen and Gregory VII (Sudendorf, pp. 224, 230) might be explained in a similar way by a determined critic, although we read of no offence committed by an ecclesiastic of Angers, distinct from the teaching of Berengar of Tours, so grave as to engage the attention of Pope and Archbishop. But the evidence from Alexander II's letters balances the scale in the contrary direction, for in Ep. iii. (Bishop), while referring to Berengar as 'sacerdoti,' he goes on to speak of his archdeaconry at Angers, and even in Ep. i. uses 'venerabili' in the address. This suggests, but does not prove, archidiaconal rank at that date.

[2] P. 7. In support of Schwabe's view we have only the frequent association of Berengar with Angers from an early date, and perhaps the difficulty of fitting the work at Tours into the career of a busy Archdeacon of Angers, unless an appeal be allowed to Durand (Migne, 149, 1422d): 'Bruno episcopus Andegavensis, sub quo archidiaconi fungebatur honore'—a passage in a work in which Berengar is not associated with Tours; and Bernold, *De Ber. Haeres. Damn. Mult.* (Rieberer, xx. 66, and Migne, 148, 1453b): 'Beringerius Andegavensis'; in the *Chronicon* Bernold calls him a 'Canon' of Angers (Migne, 148, 1377c; *Mon. Ger. SS.*, v. 427).

[3] The point is settled by other early sources. Guitmund definitely connects Berengar with both Tours and Angers: 'Ecclesia nostra a Christo fundata, non a Berengario, neque incoepta a Turonis vel Andegavis' (Hurter, xxxviii. 172). The anonymous *Chron. Mellicensis* (Migne, 213, 978d) reports that he was extracted from Tours and became Archdeacon of Angers. The condemnation at Vercelli was issued against Berengar, who referred to a clerk who was present as 'concanonicus mihi' (*D.S.C.*, p. 46); at the Roman Council of 1059 the same defendant took the oath as 'diaconus ecclesiae Sancti Maurici Andegavensis' (Lanfranc, *De Corpore*: Migne, 150, 410c); while the oath of 1079 is headed 'Turonensis presbyter' (Jaffé, *Mon. Greg.*, p. 353). The Bibliothèque d'Evreux MS. Lat. 96 (Porée, i. 10) seems to report him as Archdeacon of Tours, 'Berengarii Turonensis, ecclesiae archidiaconi,' but the interpreta-

An analysis of the cartularies of Anjou shows that in the abbeys of the city of Angers and its neighbourhood there were six or seven inmates bearing the name Berengar during his time—a curious coincidence when compared with the number to be found in the Touraine charters. At S. Nicholas, Angers, the name appears twice,[1] with the appellation 'monachus' in one case and 'grammaticus' in the other. At S. Aubin's three monks named Berengar are to be found, two of them signing the same charter. Another signature at this monastery is that of Berengar the 'presbyter,' who was not, probably, an inmate of the house.[2] At Holy Trinity there was Berengar the 'decanus'[3]—the same signature appears in the S. Aubin's cartulary[4]—and Berengar the 'stabularius.'[5] Here also Berengar, the chaplain of Guy, Count of Poitiers, signs,[6] and at Ronceray we have the signature of another chaplain named Berengar, probably chaplain of Fulk of Anjou.[7] The Necrology of the same Abbey of Holy Trinity, Vendôme, contains the name four times in the entries for the months of

---

tion depends rather on the punctuation. As it stands it need mean no more than Berengar of Tours, Archdeacon of the Church. A similar ambiguous statement appears in Higden, vii. 206: 'Berengarium Turonensem archidiaconum.' Yet P. Ragey, *Rev. du Monde Catholique*, lvii. (1879) 554, says wrongly that Berengar was Archdeacon of Tours.

[1] Lepelletier, *Brev. Fund. S. Nic.* (1616), pp. 14, 20. The first cannot refer to our Berengar because the date, 1093, is too late for him to be called 'monachus.' Lepelletier corrects the date to 1033, but the signatories were people living in 1093, the date of the charter. The term 'grammaticus' in the second of these charters hardly refers to our Berengar, because the date of the charter must be not earlier than *c.* 1050 when Grecie married Count Geoffrey (Halphen, p. 61 n. 6), again a period late for him to be designated anything but 'Archdeacon' or 'Treasurer,' or plainly 'Berengar.' This may be the 'Grammaticus' mentioned by Mabillon (*Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 12), who signs a charter of Fulk Nerra and Countess Hildegarde, in favour of S. Martin, Angers, possibly the document dated by Halphen 1028–39 (262 no. 58). The Berengar who, with Renaud, signs a charter in the time of Geoffrey Barbatus (*Brev. Fund. S. Nic.*, p. 21) was probably our Berengar. The latter was often associated with Renaud.

[2] Bertrand de Brousillon, *Cart. S. Aubin d'Angers*, i. 47 (Dec. 1038, charter of election of Abbot Walter); i. 54 (1082, election of Abbot Gerard). The name Berengar and that of several other signatories is duplicated, while four signatures of the name Robert, and three of Gausbert, appear. *Cf.* also ii. 376, i. 196.

[3] Should this be read 'diaconus'?

[4] *Cart. S. Aubin*, ii. 213.

[5] Métais, *Cart. Trin. de Vendôme*, i. 187.

[6] Métais, *Cart. Saintongeais Trin. de Vendôme*, p. 61.

[7] Marchegay, *Cart. du Ronceray*, p. 33.

February, March, November, and December. As our Berengar died in January, these obituaries cannot refer to him,[1] and, of course, not all of them necessarily or probably refer to monks who lived in his day. But although the existence of several ecclesiastics of the same name demands caution in reading the charters, yet the fact that we have at least twelve signatures of our Berengar,[2] followed by the designation 'Archdeacon' or 'Treasurer,' or both, almost entirely removes the difficulty of identification.

How early Berengar of Tours became associated with Angers cannot be decided. A doubtful tradition places him at the consecration of the Abbey of Ronceray d'Angers in 1028.[3] But he can scarcely have been Archdeacon so early, as it has been maintained.[4] His appearance as Archdeacon of Angers ten years later perhaps suggests an earlier connection with that city, but unless he went there in the interval between leaving Chartres [5] and returning to Tours, it is difficult to fit in an early residence at Angers, for, during his first ten years at Tours, he was busily occupied with re-establishing the fame of the cathedral school of S. Martin's. The earliest reliable mention of his name in the Angers charters appears in the confirmation of a donation to S. Nicholas [6] made by Fulk, Count of Anjou (1038–39),[7] shortly before his final pilgrimage to Jerusalem, a document said to have been drawn up by

---

[1] Métais, *Cart. Trin. de Vendôme*, iv. 377.

[2] They are quoted *infra*, p. 39 ff. Some of them are copies of the same charter.

[3] Célestine Port, i. 318, followed by *L'Anjou historique*, ii. 5, and Rénaudin, p. 422. No trace of Berengar's signature appears in the account of the consecration of Ronceray (*cf.* Marchegay, *Cart. du Ronceray*). The writer in *L'Anjou historique* mentions a 'document' but does not give his authority. Has there been confusion with a Bernerius 'levita et Scholae Magister' of S. Maurice, Angers, who signed the charter of dedication there Aug. 26, 1025? Urseau, *Rev. de l'Anjou*, lvii. (1908) 449 (quoting *Cart. noir d'Angers*, no. 29, p. 64).

[4] *Cf.* n. 3. But Célestine Port dates his birth 997.

[5] Clerval, p. 77, says that he went to Angers after leaving Chartres and signed a charter there in 1030, but Clerval cites no authority.

[6] Founded by Fulk Nerra, and dedicated by Hubert, Bishop of Angers, in 1020 (Halphen, p. 86).

[7] Lepelletier, *Brev. Fund. S. Nic.* (1616), p. 7 (cf. *Epitome Fundationis S. Nicolai* (1635), p. 5); Rangeard, ii. 15, dates it 1033–40; *L'Anjou hist.*, ii. 5, appears to follow the date given in the charter (1033). This has been corrected by Halphen (p. 253; *cf.* p. 86 f.) to 1038–39. Clerval, p. 77, has 1030, probably in order to fit it into a date before Berengar's return to Tours.

Renaud and Berengar.[1] In this document both have the designation 'domnus,' and they are said to have written the charter. Thus, before he became Archdeacon, Berengar was rendering services to the civil and ecclesiastical authorities at Angers; he was acting as Chancellor for the Count of Anjou. But there is no evidence that he taught in the schools of that city.[2]

By 1040 his name appears in the Angers charters as Archdeacon. In that year, on May 31, he accompanied Hubert, Bishop of Angers, to the dedication of the Abbey of Holy Trinity, Vendôme.[3] To Hubert, probably, he owed his promotion to the archidiaconate.[4] A large assembly of notable ecclesiastics was present on that day, including Arnulf, Archbishop of Tours; Thierry, Bishop of Chartres; Isembert, Bishop of Poitiers; Gervase, Bishop of Le Mans. There were distinguished clergy from S. Martin at Tours and from the Abbey of Marmoutier,[5] as well as from Angers and other churches in the neighbourhood. We have two charters, one issued by Arnulf, Archbishop of Tours, and the other by Thierry, Bishop of Chartres, both conferring privileges on the Abbey of Holy Trinity. Berengar's name appears in each of them, not among the clergy from Tours, but among those from Angers.[6] He signs as Archdeacon in each instance after Joscelin, the Dean of S. Maurice, Angers. Renaud also signs as Archdeacon. Berengar was already senior Archdeacon of Angers, although he was not yet Treasurer, for Burchard signs with this designation. At Angers the archidiaconate was well developed. The diocese was divided into three archdeaconries—Angers, Outre-Loire, and Outre-Maine.[1] In a grant made by Bishop Hubert, handing over the Church of S. Maurille de Chalonnes to the Abbey of S. Sergius, Angers, in 1040 or 1041, Berengar appears as Treasurer.[2] About 1047 he witnessed, as Archdeacon, an exchange of land between the Abbey of Holy Trinity and the Church of Notre Dame, Vendôme.[3] On January 1, 1049, both titles, Archdeacon and Treasurer, are given to him in the deed of gift by which Geoffrey, Count of Anjou,[4] handed over the Church of All Saints, Angers, to the Abbey of Holy Trinity, Vendôme, and Berengar signs immediately after Eusebius Bruno, who succeeded Hubert as bishop in 1047. Between 1040 and 1049 'Archdeacon' Berengar signed the agreement between the monks of S. Aubin, Angers, and S. Florence, Saumur, over the tithes of Scage-aux-Moines (Chalgiago).[5] In 1053 the Church of S. Clement, Craon, was granted to Holy Trinity, Vendôme, by Geoffrey Martel. Berengar signed this document as Archdeacon on March 26 in that year.[6] But apparently a dispute arose over the transaction, for we find that S. Clement reverted to S. Aubin's, by a charter signed by Berengar as Treasurer, some time before 1059,[7] and the matter was not finally settled until 1072, when the original grant in favour of Holy Trinity, Vendôme, was confirmed at Chartres.[8]

---

[1] Lepelletier, *Breviculum*, p. 7; Halphen, p. 106 n. 4; Rangeard, ii. 15. The repeated association with Renaud in the charters enables us to identify the 'domnus' Berengar with the Archdeacon (*cf.* Métais, *Cart. Trin. de Vendôme*, i. 91, 232; Marchegay, *Cart. du Ronceray*, p. 141; etc.). Renaud is described as Scolasticus (*Epit. S. Nic.*, ed. 1635, p. 18). He was sent from Marmoutier to become Abbot of S. Nicolas, but left before he was consecrated, for the Abbey of Holy Trinity, Vendôme, where Geoffrey Martel had promised to make him Abbot. The promise was not fulfilled (Halphen, pp. 86, 253 f.), as we find him later signing charters with Berengar as 'domnus.'

[2] Cf. *Hist. Litt.*, viii. 200. Rangeard, ii. 21, says that he taught at Angers. Cf. *L'Anjou hist.*, ii. 4. Pletteau, p. 19, says that Berengar taught grammar, but not theology, at Angers in the time of Bishop Hubert.

[3] Métais, *Cart. Trin. de Vendôme*, i. 89, 91. This abbey is to be distinguished from the priory of Holy Trinity at Angers.

[4] Halphen, p. 116, thinks that his appointment was influenced by Fulk, Count of Anjou.

[5] 'A monasterio Sancti Martini' to be clearly distinguished from the collegiate church of S. Martin at Tours.

[6] 'A civitate Andegava.'

---

[1] Halphen, p. 116 n. 2; Urseau, *Cart. noir d'Angers*, p. xxxix f. Three archdeacons—Arnulf, Sigo, and Adelard—witnessed a grant made by Thierry, Bishop of Chartres, to Marmoutier in 1060 (Métais, *Cart. Blesois Marmoutier*, p. 48). Five archdeacons—Hilduin, Stephen, Gerard, Walter, and Theobald—signed a charter in 1102 in favour of the Abbey of Cormery (Bourassé, *Cart. de Cormery*, p. 107). On the archidiaconate in France, *cf.* Hinschius, *Kirchenrecht*, ii. 189–93.

[2] *Cart. eccles. Andegav.* quoted by Rangeard, ii. 21. This charter is dated 1041 in *Gallia Christiana*, xiv. 559.

[3] Métais, *Cart. Saintongeais Trin. Vendôme*, p. 38.

[4] Métais, *Cart. Trin. Vendôme*, i. 167; Urseau, *Cart. noir d'Angers*, p. 97.

[5] Bertrand de Brousillon, *Cart. S. Aubin*, i. 230.

[6] Métais, *Cart. Trin. Vendôme*, i. 178. *Cf.* Brousillon, *Cart. du Craon*, i. 32, where Berengar signs as Treasurer.

[7] Métais, *Cart. Trin. Vendôme*, i. 232.

[8] Bertrand de Brousillon, *Cart. S. Aubin*, ii. 211 ff.

Berengar's name does not appear among the signatures of this charter, although we find the signature of Berengar the Dean, probably of Holy Trinity. In a document dated February 6, 1056, the signature 'Berengar presbyter' appears first,[1] and in a charter of May 26, 1060, appears the signature of Berengar 'presbyter of S. Martin.'[2] The presence of the one at the head of the list, and the designation 'de Sancto Martino,' suggest our Berengar, but these names appear in a cartulary where Berengar is frequently designated Archdeacon or Treasurer. It is just possible that the eucharistic dispute, which by this time was in full course, may have caused the Angers ecclesiastics to desire to dissociate themselves from Berengar, and if the regulation drawn up by a synod at Angers in 1060,[3] forbidding clergy who were not resident at Angers from holding any clerical office there, had been drawn up by May 26, we may have an explanation for the second of these signatures. It is significant that we have no document certainly signed by Berengar as Archdeacon or Treasurer after 1059.[4] The ruling at the Synod of Angers (1060) may also account for this, and for the fact that in his book *De Sacra Cœna*, written after 1060, Berengar does not allude to himself as Archdeacon. Moreover, about 1060, Geoffrey Barbatus, Count of Anjou, ejected Berengar from Angers and confiscated his revenues.[5] On the other hand, it is possible that these two documents, which were not concerned with important matters,[6] and were not witnessed by distinguished clergy, were signed by another Berengar, who was, at the time, a presbyter of S. Martin's. The term 'presbyter' would then be introduced to distinguish him from Berengar the Archdeacon.

---

[1] Métais, *Cart. Trin. Vendôme*, i. 189.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 239.

[3] Schnitzer, p. 8 n. 5, but Schwabe, p. 10, discounts the effect of the regulation on Berengar, and certainly about 1062 Berengar possessed the status of Archdeacon (*infra*, p. 143). The Angers regulation repeats canon 5 of the Councils of Vienne and Tours (1060). *Cf.* Héfélé–Leclercq iv. pt. ii. 1203, and *infra*, p. 133.

[4] Rangeard, ii. 21, reports that Berengar signed a document of S. Florence as 'Grammaticus' and 'Magister Scholae' in 1067. He quotes no authority. Urseau, *Rev. de l'Anjou*, p. 437, states that Berengar preserved the title of Archdeacon down to 1079 (*cf. ibid.* p. 436 n. 8 and 443 n. 3, quoting Marchegay, *Archives de Maine et Loire*).

[5] *Cf. infra*, p. 143.

[6] One deals with the gift of a freedman named Benedict to Holy Trinity, by Archembald, Provost of Vendôme. The other records a conveyance of land by a woman named Guitburga, and her son and daughter, to the same house.

An interesting document relating to a dispute over some land belonging to the archdeaconry of Angers, during Berengar's tenure, has been preserved.[1] Marchoard, a retainer[2] of Hugh of S. Maur, had despoiled the Archdeacon of the property[3] of Ternant, and had been under excommunication for some time. When Marchoard was lying ill in the hospital of S. Florence, he and his son, who was also named Marchoard, with the consent of Hugh of S. Maur, agreed to restore the land to Berengar. The settlement was completed at the altar of S. Florence, when Berengar agreed to allow Marchoard the son to hold the property for his lifetime, or for that of one heir, if such were born to him in lawful wedlock, and on the payment of a sum of money, to be made annually in the Chapter of S. Maurice, on the Feast of S. Maurice. A payment which a certain cultivator[4] had wrongly made to the elder Marchoard should in future go to the Archdeacon. This settlement Marchoard the sick man agreed to confirm in the Chapter of S. Maurice on the Feast of S. Andrew or on Christmas Day. The document reveals the large amount of freedom enjoyed at that day by the occupants of cathedral prebends in the administration of the property attached to the prebends, and also the difficulty which even distinguished ecclesiastics like Berengar sometimes had in preserving the lands of the church from alienation.[5]

The assertion has been made, although without proofs, that Berengar taught grammar at Angers without holding the office of scolasticus in that city.[6] It has also been maintained, on the ground of his frequent visits to Angers, which are indicated by the signatures in the charters, that he propagated his teaching there.[1] At the beginning of the fifteenth century a chair carved out of the rock existed in the cemetery of S. Laurence at Angers, which is said to have occupied the site of an earlier one from which Berengar taught his doctrine through popular addresses.[2] The latter statement may be dismissed as an aetiological legend.[3] The former only suggests a probability that the subject nearest his heart was sometimes discussed by Berengar with his friends at Angers. The Angers records do not charge him with specific teaching on the Eucharist there.

---

[1] Urseau, *Cart. noir d'Angers*, p. 111 f. The incident is dated 1040–80.

[2] 'miles.' [3] 'terra.' [4] 'colonus.'

[5] In spite of all this evidence Pletteau says that Berengar only fulfilled his archidiaconal duties at rare intervals, and obtained leave from Hubert to depart from Angers, retaining only 'honorary' titles (p. 15). He fulfilled no efficacious rôle in the diocese (p. 19; *cf.* pp. 59, 61). Yet Pletteau is aware that his name appears in the charters. Berengar complained in later years that Geoffrey Barbatus hindered him from fulfilling his duties at Angers (*cf. infra*, p. 143).

[6] *L'Anjou historique*, ii. (1901) 4. In 1040 John was Scolasticus at Angers (Métais, *Cart. Trin. de Vendôme*, pp. 85, 90); and from 1056 to 1075 Renaud was Scholae-Magister there (Brousillon, *Cart. S. Aubin*, i. 94, 118, 185, 209, 304). *Cf. supra*, p. 39 n. 2.

---

[1] *L'Anjou historique*, ii. (1901), p. 5 ff.

[2] Uzureau, *Andegavana*, i. 85.

[3] *Cf. infra*, p. 221, for a similar argument drawn from the procession of the Fête-Dieu at Angers.

CHAPTER III

OUTBREAK OF THE SECOND EUCHARISTIC CONTROVERSY

A CERTAIN similarity is characteristic of the breaking-out [1] of great periods of advance or recovery in the history of doctrine. A restlessness is felt in the minds of thinkers, a dissatisfaction with accepted dogmas takes a hold on thought, which comes to expression in formal or informal conferences and through the medium of published treatises. Then appears a master-mind which grasps the scattered strands of thought, unites them, and produces a doctrine which appears to a wondering world to be entirely new. The power of intellect and force of personality of this interpreter cause him to be regarded as the creator of the new system of ideas which thenceforth strongly influences thought and conduct. This was the process witnessed in every controversy from Monarchianism to Monophysitism and Pelagianism. It characterised the period of enlightenment of the Reformation time. It has been seen in our own day manipulating the great contribution made to human thought and philosophy by the men of science. Ideas are generated and get about in the intellectual atmosphere, but they do not come to an outbreak, which in turn issues in an advance of doctrine, until one acute mind begins to act as an interpreter.

In the Middle Ages the process, while remaining true to this type, possessed some special features. The interpreter appeared, but the ideas upon which he took hold were not simmering in men's minds; they were rather floating in the stream of tradition, and were therefore only accessible to the few who had sufficient learning to detect and make use of them. They were not always detected by those who had the necessary qualification.[1] Consequently, when a Paschasius Radbert or a Berengar of Tours adopted and popularised a strand of teaching already existing in the intellectual traditions behind them, they were regarded as innovators by an astonished world. This occurred more especially in the case of Berengar than of Radbert. It partly explains why, in his own day, he failed to reach the dimensions of a reformer, and why, for centuries, he was regarded as a mere innovator. Yet, if the conditions of medieval thought prevented him from influencing the development of doctrine in his own day, they came round full circle and preserved his teaching—or at least the ideas to which he gave adherence—in the stream of tradition, floating and unattached indeed, but waiting in silent potency until they got loose at the Reformation, when they influenced men's minds so strongly that they became, through the instrumentality of the Reformers, part of the new body of doctrine.[2]

---

[1] 'Aufklärung' expresses the idea more clearly.

These conditions of doctrinal development in the Middle Ages should be recollected when we seek for the sources of Berengar's teaching. The personal factor was certainly at work. His inquiring mind and rational habits of thought obviously disposed him to criticise accepted standards and doctrines. But he did not become the spokesman of ideas which were ranging around in men's minds. He received his inspiration from a tradition not generally accepted by the orthodox, but actually existing in the body of teaching or interpretation handed down from the past. That tradition was embedded in the ancient Augustinian doctrine.[3] His nearest channels of communication with Augustinianism lay in the writings of John the Scot and in those of Ratramn, which Berengar by a strange mischance attributed to John the Scot. The nature of Berengar's obligation to these writers we shall investigate in the doctrinal section of this work. All that is required here is to observe that the teaching of Augustine, operating through John the Scot and Ratramn, was the cause of the outbreak of the second eucharistic controversy.[1]

---

[1] Most men in the Middle Ages were more strongly affected by practical movements like the Crusades and the rise of the Mendicants.

[2] The doctrine of Ratramn was well known in the Reformation era. *Cf.* Nägle, p. 84 ff.

[3] Most Churchmen of Berengar's day followed the Ambrosian type of eucharistic doctrine.

The high estimation in which Berengar held the teaching of John the Scot was made clear in the early days of the controversy. In his letter to Lanfranc in the spring of 1049,[2] Berengar rebukes the Prior of Bec because he counted 'as heresy the opinions of John the Scot on the sacrament of the altar, in which he disagrees with your accepted Paschasius,' and concludes with his often repeated dictum:[3] 'If you hold John a heretic, whose opinions on the Eucharist we approve, you ought to hold as heretics Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine, not to mention others.'

Writing to another friend, Ascelin,[4] towards the end of 1050,[5] Berengar complained that a certain William had boasted that Berengar could not deny that John the Scot was a heretic. Ascelin could testify, if he remembered Berengar's words, that this was false, although Ascelin himself held that John the Scot was a heretic, which was an opinion quite unworthy of his priesthood. If he held the doctrine of Paschasius he acted against reason and evangelical and apostolical opinions. With regard to his own utterances, Berengar did not maintain that everything that John the Scot said was true, but he could prove from the writings of the Fathers, mentioned in his letter to Lanfranc, that they also must be regarded as heretics if John the Scot were condemned. He ends by warning Ascelin against saying that he (Berengar) had condemned John the Scot.

About a year later, in the autumn of 1051, he wrote to another friend named Richard.[6] In this letter Berengar maintained that John the Scot had been unjustly condemned, and Paschasius Radbert had been equally unjustly approved at the Council of Vercelli, held in September of the year before. John the Scot, he says, wrote at the request of the Emperor Charles the Great [1] in order to confute the 'follies of carnal illiterates' which prevailed at that time.

---

[1] Batiffol (1905), p. 354, says that Berengar appears to have been acquainted with John the Scot's book on the Eucharist.

[2] Migne, 150, 63c.

[3] *Cf.* 'Epis. to Ascelin' (Migne, 150 and 66b); *De Sacra Cœna,* pp. 36, 38.

[4] Migne, 150, 66.

[5] Sudendorf, pp. 10–17. Dates assigned by other writers for this letter are here discussed.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 211 f.; *cf.* p. 117 ff. Mansi, xix. 784.

Throughout the controversy of the next thirty years Berengar, in spite of formal recantations, did not relax from his adherence to John the Scot and his teaching,[2] and coupled with this positive attitude was his equally consistent criticism of Paschasius Radbert. That appears in each of the letters already quoted, and is a constant theme in his great polemical work, the *De Sacra Cœna*.[3] Whether he began by disagreeing with the teaching of Paschasius, and then found a basis for his own constructive thought in John the Scot's writings, or whether, when already under the influence of the latter, he found himself unable to agree with Radbert's doctrine, is not clear; but so far as John the Scot supplied a positive foundation for Berengar's interpretation of the doctrine of the Eucharist, we may safely attribute the rise of the controversy to the influence of Augustine exerted through that channel, and also through Ratramn, if, as is probable, Berengar also studied Ratramn, although wrongly with his contemporaries attributing Ratramn's work on the Eucharist to John the Scot.

The influence of John the Scot upon Berengar as a source of the controversy was particularly noticed by the writers of the next generation.[4] Some of his contemporaries attributed to him quite unworthy motives, which indeed are often, without justification, assigned to the exponents of new or unfamiliar ideas. Guitmund accused him of seeking to obtain the admiration of men through the medium of his teaching,[5] even to the extent of gaining the favour of evil-living communicants.[6] Lanfranc accused him of desiring to acquire a cheap popularity.[7] That he was perhaps susceptible to flattery is suggested in a letter from his friend Drogo of Paris,[1] and this is consonant with the nervous self-consciousness of his temperament. But that he attempted to influence others from selfish motives and by sordid means is a slander which is belied by the widely recognised integrity of Berengar's character, and can be disregarded. The charge was not repeated by writers who were equally strongly opposed to his teaching. Another accusation made by Guitmund was that, seeing the numbers of his pupils at Tours decline through the growing success of Lanfranc's new school at Bec, Berengar, moved by jealousy, attempted to regain his influence by attacking the scriptural teaching of the Sacraments.[2] But there is not a trace of this jealousy in Berengar's friendly letter to Lanfranc, and this charge also may be dismissed.

---

[1] He means Charles the Bald.

[2] *D.S.C.*, pp. 35–38, 43.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 33–37, 65, 68, 81, 84, 174, 182, 222, 281.

[4] *Hist. Franc. Fragment* (Bouquet, xi. 161c); *Chron. Tur.* (Bouq., xii. 461b). Also Durand of Troarn, his contemporary (Migne, 149, 1423a). Stäudlin, ii. 18 f., thinks that Berengar did not intend to defend the views of John the Scot as his own—a curious interpretation of the evidence.

[5] Hurter, xxxviii. 6.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 8.

[7] Migne, 150, 414b.

If the source and cause of Berengar's teaching can be fairly clearly estimated, the date and occasion of its appearance are wrapped in obscurity and surrounded by difficulties. The doctrine of the Eucharist was being discussed, when Berengar was a student, by Fulbert of Chartres. Two correspondents, Einard and Adeodatus[3] by name, received letters from Fulbert in which both the cultus and theory of the Eucharist were treated. But apart from the legend of William of Malmesbury[4] there is no authority for connecting Fulbert's action with Berengar.[5] Indeed it is not clear that this correspondence refers to current conceptions. At Orleans and Arras certain innovators were condemned to death by the ecclesiastical authorities between 1022 and 1025.[6] But the phraseology of Fulbert's letter to Adeodatus, and its particular reference to Arius and Sabellius, Nestorius, Macedonius, and Marcion, suggest that he had in mind the great heresiarchs of the ancient Church, and that when he refers to 'those who cut themselves off from the unity of the Church and become teachers of error,' [1] he is using the historic present tense to warn his contemporaries against the influence of earlier teaching. Nevertheless, if Fulbert actually discussed the main subject of these two letters in the schools of Chartres, especially if he confuted the symbolic interpretation of the Sacrament,[2] Berengar may have received an idea which then or later became assimilated in his mind with the teaching of John the Scot.[3]

---

[1] Sudendorf, p. 211.

[2] Hurter, xxxviii. 7: 'ad eructanda impudenter divinarum Scripturarum sacramenta.' *Cf.* Heurtevent, p. 124: 'la source est très tendancieuse, et ne mérite qu'un crédit mesuré.' It is 'une assertion non prouvée.' Brucker, ii. 138, follows Guitmund, and says that Berengar visited Bec, and was there discomfited by Lanfranc. The sources do not report this visit. The statement of Guitmund (Hurter, xxxviii. 7), 'a D. Lanfranco in dialectica de re satis parva turpiter est confusus,' refers probably to Lanfranc's visit to Tours (*cf. infra*, p. 49).

[3] Migne, 141, 192–195; 196–204.

[4] *Cf. supra*, p. 17.

[5] F. Vernet in *Dict. de Théol. Cath.*, ii. 723, following Clerval, p. 42, thinks that Fulbert was dealing with doctrines that contained the germ of Berengar's teaching.

[6] *Cf. infra*, p. 245.

Lanfranc, who left Italy after the winter of 1036, appears to have passed a short time at Tours on his journey across France, and to have attended the lectures of Berengar. The teaching of the Scolasticus did not meet with Lanfranc's approval, his doctrine was not sound.[4] It is therefore possible to trace back the beginning of Berengar's eucharistic teaching to about the year 1037. But that he was then, or for many years afterwards, to be found among those who 'cut themselves off from the unity of the Church' is entirely contradicted by his appointment to important offices at Angers, and by the surprise created in the minds of his friends at a later period, when his views became fully known.

In 1047 Berengar's pupil [5] and friend, Eusebius Bruno, was made Bishop of Angers, but there is no evidence for attributing the publication of Berengar's teaching to the sense of security which the appointment created for the Archdeacon, nor to the approval which Geoffrey Martel, the powerful Count of Anjou, extended towards him.[6] Nor can the letter of Adelmann to Berengar, written while the former was still at Liège, be used with quite the same confidence to fix the date when Berengar's views became known, as formerly[1] when it was believed that Adelmann became Bishop of Brescia in 1048,[2] and when it was assumed consequently that an earlier letter, which no longer survives, was written in 1046.[3] It has been proved that Adelmann did not become Bishop of Brescia until about 1057,[4] so that his first letter to Berengar, which referred to Berengar's erroneous teaching, may have been written long after 1046.[5] None the less, as Adelmann makes no reference to the Councils of Rome and Vercelli (1050), nor to the Council of Paris (1051), there is still ground for the possibility that his second letter to Berengar was written before 1050,[6] and that the first, as he says, was sent two years before.

---

[1] Migne, 141, 197b: 'ab unitate Ecclesiae divisi, dum fieri nolunt discipuli veritatis, magistri, fiunt erroris.'

[2] *Ibid.* 202a: 'non inanis mysterii symbolum.'

[3] I see that a similar suggestion has been made by Dr. Darwell Stone, i. 244.

[4] *Mirac. de S. Nic.* (Evreux MS. Lat. 96; Porée, i. 10 n. 2): 'intelligens non eum esse sane doctrina abscessit eo.' The late writer, Henry of Knighton (i. 90), reports that Lanfranc and Berengar disputed in the schools: 'quando in scholis militavimus.'

[5] This has been questioned (cf. *Hist. Litt.*, viii. 99); but Clerval, p. 78: 'Eusèbe Bruno . . . son élève.'

[6] Delarc, *Rev. des Quest. hist.*, xx. 121 f. *Cf.* Rénaudin, p. 423. But the latter wrongly dates Eusebius' elevation 1037.

In the letter which has survived, Adelmann prays that the Lord may turn his friend from the paths of the heretics, and may show that those who blacken Berengar's fame are liars. The unfavourable reports were spreading everywhere, so that Adelmann had heard in Belgium, where he had lived a long time,[7] accounts which represented Berengar to be separated from the unity of the holy mother Church, because his teaching on the body and blood of the Lord was otherwise than the Catholic faith held, namely, that Berengar taught that the body of Christ is not 'true,' nor the blood, but is 'a certain figure and similitude.'[8] Adelmann says that when he heard these reports two years before, he communicated with Berengar through Paulinus, the Precentor of Metz, who was a more intimate friend of Berengar than he himself. Paulinus had not replied, and he was to be blamed for that; but now, unexpectedly, Adelmann was stupefied with joy by the appearance of a messenger from Berengar, who, however, had brought no letter with him. Yet, deciding to accept his credentials, he had made him the bearer of the present letter, in which he prayed Berengar through the mercy of God, through the sweet memory of Fulbert, that Berengar might have Catholic peace and not disturb the republic of the Christian State. He urges him to take shelter under the renown of great leaders like Ambrose, Augustine, and Jerome, and warns him that it is the greatest madness to oppose them in matters either of faith or conduct. Adelmann then expounds at length his own views on the doctrine of the Eucharist. He complains of the strange accent which Berengar was teaching his pupils to use, and advises him to coerce heart and tongue from evil and to do penance. He concludes by saying that he has discussed the doctrine of the Eucharist at greater length than in his first letter, which he believes had not reached Berengar, and urges him to break the long silence by writing to him in order to relieve him of anxiety.[1]

---

[1] Stäudlin, ii. 18; Delarc, *Rev. des Quest. hist.*, xx. 126 ff.; Rénaudin, p. 426; Ébersolt, p. 23; Herzog, *Realencyklopädie*, ii. 608.

[2] Gradenigo, p. xxxv.

[3] Héfélé–Leclercq, iv. pt. ii. 1046, say that Berengar began to attract attention about 1040, but Leclercq thinks that Héfélé here refers to the letter to Joscelin (Sudendorf, p. 200 ff.). More probably Héfélé goes back from the traditional date of Adelmann's second letter (1048). Jean Hiretius, p. 104, says that Berengar preached against the Sacrament in 1041. A twelfth-century fragment on the History of France gives 1047 (Bouq., xi. 161c; *cf.* 527b). *Cf.* Ceillier, xx. 281; De Roye, p. 34; and de Crozals, p. 87. The *Chron. Belgicum* (Bouq., xi. 527b) gives 1048.

[4] Steindorff, ii. 299 n. 5, quoting *Annales Altahenses* and other sources.

[5] Schwabe, p. 22, dates it 1053–57.

[6] Schnitzer, p. 19; Ébersolt, p. 23; Delarc, *Rev. des Quest. hist.*, xx. 128. Sudendorf, p. 7, dates it 1047 or early in 1048.

[7] Heurtevent, p. 288: 'Teutonicas aures, inter quas diu peregrinor repleverint.' This need not refer to Germany, as some writers allege.

[8] *Ibid.*: 'sed figuram quamdam similitudinem.'

Adelmann writes in the most friendly terms, and the long epistle is filled with a spirit of charity, showing the kindly relation which existed between Berengar and his friends. But he writes unreservedly in terms which would surely have included a reference to Berengar's condemnation at Rome and Vercelli (1050), if that had already taken place. The letter shows clearly that Berengar's views had become widely known at least two years before it was written, not later than the spring of 1050.[2] Berengar sent no reply for a long time.

Stronger support for the early appearance of his teaching is to be found in the letter of Hugh, Bishop of Langres. Hugh was deposed on moral grounds at the Synod of Reims (1049), and died soon after his restoration by Leo IX at the Easter Council of Rome (1050). It is improbable that Hugh's letter was written after the Synod of Reims, for during the interval between the Synod and his return journey to France, which ended with his death in the autumn of 1050, he remained in disgrace in the entourage of the Pope.[1]

---

[1] Adelmann, 'Epis. to Berengar' (Heurtevent, Appendix II; Migne, 143, 1289–1296; C. A. Schmid (1770)). The end of the letter is missing in Migne. Heurtevent's text is used throughout this work.

[2] *Cf. supra*, p. 50 n. 6.

Hugh [2] criticises Berengar for scrutinising the opinions of the Fathers by distraught and prejudiced methods. Otherwise he would not say that the sacrament of the body and blood of our Lord was a body and yet incorporeal. He accuses him of speaking with an 'exceedingly wide mouth,' and of saying 'very loudly' that the nature and essence of the bread and wine were not changed, and only existed as mental concepts, so scandalising the universal Church, and offending against its Author, who offered to our eyes palpably that which Berengar affirmed to be incorporeal.[3] He urges him to cease being a soldier of error and to cease fighting against the heavenly mystery.[4] He refers to a conversation with Berengar on the mysteries when Hugh had tried to ascertain how he interpreted them.[5]

Schwabe refuses to admit this letter as evidence for the dissemination of Berengar's teaching before 1050, on the ground that it was written by a later Bishop of Langres, named Renaud Hugh, who is called Hugh of Langres in many contemporary documents, especially in charters and letters. He was Bishop of Langres from 1065 to 1085, and a scholar and writer against whose character no charge was ever brought, as against the earlier bishop of the same name, and was therefore more capable of writing a long dogmatic epistle to Berengar.[6]

---

[1] Laurence of Liège, *Gesta episcoporum Virdunensium* (*Mon. Ger. SS.*, x. 493), which also reports his deposition in 1049 and death in 1050, followed by Schwabe, p. 26, with footnote. *Cf.* Steindorff, ii. 134, 163 n. 3, following the faulty *Chron. S. Benigni Divionensis* (*Mon. Ger. SS.*, vii. 237), for the consecration of Harduin, Hugh's successor at Langres, by Leo IX in 1050 (reported verbatim also by *Chron. Bernense*, Bouq., xi. 203c), but Steindorff places the restoration of Hugh in 1051, not in 1052 as the *Chron. S. Benig. Div.* says. Schwabe misquotes Will, i. 106, for the date of the feast at Rome, where the poisoned fish was eaten which killed Hélinand, Bishop of Lyons, and probably caused the death of Hugh. Will gives 1053, correcting the *Chron. S. Benig. Div.*, which has 1052, yet Schwabe wrongly quotes Will for 1052. Höfler, ii. 163, also gives 1053 from this chronicle, but with some reserve (*cf.* his footnote, p. 28).

[2] Migne, 142, 1325–1334. Sudendorf, p. 9, dates the letter before October 3, 1049.

[3] Migne, 142, 1327a. [4] *Ibid.* 1328d. [5] *Ibid.* 1334a.

[6] P. 27 ff. Schwabe's dating of this letter is put forth in support of his main contention that Berengar's teaching was first made known at the Roman Council of 1050. Loofs, *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1888, p. 565, says that he is convinced by Schwabe's proofs (' diese Nachweise

But as Schnitzer [1] conclusively argues, in this case the letter must have been written after 1065, following not only the Councils of Rome, Vercelli, and Paris, but the Synod of Tours (1054) and the great Roman Council of 1059, when Berengar's condemnation was emphatically repeated. As Hugh loses no opportunity of criticising Berengar in hard terms, it is obvious that he would have alluded to these councils if they had already taken place. We may add that it is improbable that Hugh II would have taken the trouble to secure an interview with a heretic who had been so often condemned. Moreover, the explanation of the theory of the change in the elements, given in this letter, was more detailed and acute than that of any previous writer, yet it omits all reference to the dialectical discussion of the nature of essence, introduced in the second stage of the controversy, an omission which was extremely improbable if the letter had been written by the second Hugh of Langres. The letter, therefore, was written before 1050 by the earlier Hugh, and before 1049 for the reasons already given.

The occasion of the outbreak of the second eucharistic controversy was supplied by the letter sent by Berengar to Lanfranc in the autumn of 1049: [2]

> There comes to me, brother Lanfranc, a certain report from Ingelran of Chartres on which I have no right to hesitate from admonishing your love. It has displeased you, yea you regard as heresy the opinion of John the Scot on the sacrament of the altar, in which he disagrees with your accepted Paschasius. If this is

---

halte ich für stichhaltig'), but cannot accept his conclusions therefrom. Loofs thinks the events of 1050 inexplicable unless Berengar's teaching was widely known before then. On the other hand, Schwabe's criticism (p. 23 ff.) of the inferences drawn from Gozechin's letter (Migne, 143, 885–908) by Mabillon (*Analecta*, p. 446), Stäudlin, ii. 18, and Sudendorf, p. 32, appears to be conclusive. Gozechin refers to the 'sudden calamity' of the death of the Emperor Henry III (1056) and of Liutbold, Archbishop of Mainz (1059), and then says that for two lustra the Church had suffered trouble. This makes the date of his epistle 1069, and it refers to the spread of Berengar's teaching in 1059 and not in 1050, as Mabillon, etc., by throwing back the two lustra from 1059, alleged.

[1] P. 19; *cf.* Ébersolt, p. 24; Delarc, *Rev. des Quest. hist.*, xx. 124.

[2] Loofs, p. 571, following Sudendorf, p. 38, thinks that the controversy broke out at the Synod of Tours held by Geoffrey Martel early in 1050, but the date of this synod was 1051. *Cf. infra*, p. 85.

so brother, you have acted unworthily of the intellect which God gave you in no mean degree, by expressing an opinion over-hastily. For not yet have you busied yourself to such an extent in holy Scripture with your more diligent friends. Now, therefore, brother, however unlearned in that Scripture I may be, I would like only to hear about it, if opportunity occurred to me, in the presence of those you would wish, either as suitable arbiters or as listeners. So long as this is not done you should not look with scorn on what I say. If you regard John as a heretic, whose opinions on the Eucharist I approve, you ought to hold as heretics Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine, not to mention others.[1]

Why was Lanfranc criticising John the Scot's views on the Eucharist? Obviously the subject was a matter of public discussion at the time in ecclesiastical circles. The incident supplies final proof that Berengar's teaching was well known for a year or two before 1049.[2] We know of only one source from which such a discussion was likely to arise at that date—the school of S. Martin at Tours. The letter of Berengar does not suggest that Lanfranc had so far attacked him, and although formerly they had disagreed on the subject,[3] on this occasion Lanfranc seems to have been content to challenge rather the teaching of John the Scot than to embroil an old friend in the dispute.

It is probable that up to this point of time, and until after the Council of Vercelli, Berengar was content with teaching and expounding the views of John the Scot or Ratramn or both, without developing any independent conclusions, although, as the letters of Adelmann and Hugh of Langres show, his own name was being associated widely with heretical teaching.

Berengar's letter to Lanfranc was directed to Bec,[4] and consequently was probably written before the citations of Leo IX for the Synod of Reims,[1] issued on September 14, had appeared. Leo summoned the leading ecclesiastics of France north of the Loire, and those of Burgundy, Flanders, and Normandy.[2] Whether Berengar was included we do not know, but when the citations appeared, he would have realised that the distinguished Prior of Bec, who acted as a counsellor to Duke William, would be included, especially as Normandy was not under the jurisdiction of Henry I, King of France, and so its clergy were not included within the prohibition of Henry, which prevented two-thirds of the French bishops and abbots from attending the Synod.[3] If the citations had appeared when Berengar wrote, he would not have directed the letter to Bec.

---

[1] Migne, 150, 63c. The writer of the article in *De Katholiek* (The Hague, 1858-9, translated by A. Delvigne in *Vérité historique*, iii. and iv., 1859) dates this letter 1050 (*ibid.* 197, 250). This article is a trenchant criticism of Sudendorf, but while some of its statements have been substantiated by later writers, it contains several blunders of its own, some of them so bad as to suggest faulty proof-reading. Berengar is called Archdeacon of Tours in the title of the article; p. 294 contains a curious confusion between Ansfroi of Préaux and Durand. He gives two dates for the death of Leo IX—1053 (p. 240), 1054 (p. 239).

[2] Even Schwabe (p. 30) admits that Berengar's teaching was known by his own scholars before 1050.

[3] Henry of Knighton, i. 90.

[4] Lanfranc (Migne, 150, 413a): 'Portitor earum legatus tuus, me in Nortmannia non reperto, tradidit eas quibusdam clericis.' Heurtevent, p. 131 n. 6, regards these words as a later interpolation, on the ground

The bearer gave the letter to certain clerks at Bec, who opened it, and when they saw that it contained statements which appeared to be contrary to the teaching of the Church, they gave it to others to read and verbally made the contents known.[4] The letter was sent on to Reims. Here it does not

---

that they do not occur in Berengar's quotation of the passage (*D.S.C.*, p. 33). But even so they may well have been added by Lanfranc himself at the time when he inserted the account of Pope Gregory's Roman Council of 1079 (Migne, 150, 411b). In this case Berengar was quoting from an earlier edition of Lanfranc's *De Corpore et Sang. Dom.* Heurtevent does not dispute the fact that the letter was delivered at Bec (p. 131), but that it was opened and read by the clergy there (*ibid.* n. 6). Schnitzer, p. 25 ff., summarises the discussion which has arisen on the transit of this letter. De Crozals, p. 89, regards the letter as an attempt to convert Lanfranc to his cause.

[1] P. P. Brucker, ii. 1–42, gives a full account of the Synod. While stressing its importance for the revival of papal influence in France, he admits that it would be an exaggeration to say that Leo saved French Catholicism (p. 5). *Cf.* Héfélé–Leclercq, iv. pt. ii. 1011–1028; Bröcking, pp. 18–35.

[2] Bröcking, *Die französische Politik Papst Leo IX*, p. 13.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 19. But Brucker (p. 9 f.) shows that the leading French bishops and abbots were present. The list includes familiar names like Frollant of Senlis, Hélinand of Lyons, Hugh of Langres, Geoffrey of Coutances, and Eusebius of Angers. Duduc, Bishop of Wells, was present, and also Wulfric, Abbot of S. Augustine, Canterbury, and Alwin, Abbot of Ramsey (cf. *Sax. Chron.* E. anno 1046 and D. 1050). Leo wrote to Edward the Confessor, from the Council, urging Leofric of Exeter to transfer his see from Crediton to Exeter, and expressed surprise that he had no episcopal city (p. 38). The Archbishop of Sens was among those absent with the King.

[4] Lanfranc (Migne, 150, 413a): 'tradidit eas quibusdam clericis: quas cum legissent, et contra usitatissimam Ecclesiae fidem animadvertissent, zelo Dei accensi quibusdam ad legendum eas porrexerunt,

seem to have been handed to Lanfranc. Probably the Bec monks, partly on account of its contents which they regarded seriously, and partly on account of antipathy to the Prior,[1] caused it to be given to Pope Leo by the bearer, a clerk from Reims.[2] The Pope was in a difficult situation. Berengar was a protégé, not only of Eusebius Bruno, the Bishop of Angers, but of Geoffrey Martel, Count of Anjou, and he was a Canon of S. Martin at Tours, where Henry I held the official title of Abbot. At this time Leo was beginning to establish the authority of the Curia over the French bishops and abbots, especially in order to secure canonical election to the higher ecclesiastical offices, and to check simony and clerical marriage. He therefore wished to secure recognition of his authority by Henry I and Geoffrey of Anjou.[3] Already he had been compelled to circumvent the opposition of the former to the assembly of the Synod on French soil;[4] and the imprisonment of Gervase, Bishop of Le Mans, by Geoffrey, called for attention.[5] Thus there were several reasons why he should avoid exacerbating relations with those rulers by a condemnation of Berengar at this time.[6] So Berengar's letter to Lanfranc was not divulged by Leo at Reims.

On the other hand, up to February 12 of this year (1049) Leo had been Bishop of Toul, and he must have been aware of Berengar's inclination for the teaching of John the

---

plurimis earum sententias verbis exposuerunt.' Milo Crispin (Migne, 150, 36a–b) follows Lanfranc's account. Stäudlin, ii. 29, thinks that the mere fact that Berengar had written, and not the contents of the letter, was sufficient to cast suspicion upon Lanfranc. Gfrörer, *Allgemeine Kirchengesch.*, iv. pt. i. 534, says that Lanfranc received the letter at Bec, and took it with him to Rome. *Cf.* Lessing, p. 96.

[1] *Cf.* Macdonald, p. 23 f.

[2] Lanfranc (Migne, 150, 413b): 'Igitur cum a quodam Remensi clerico Roman perlatas.' This statement is inexplicable unless the letter had been sent on from Bec to Reims. Moreover, Leo IX's order, issued at Reims, that Lanfranc should accompany him to Rome, suggests the receipt of definite information.

[3] Bröcking, chapter I. But Bröcking maintains that Leo did not raise the questions of clerical marriage and simony at Reims (*ibid.* p. 21 f.). *Cf.* Drehman, p. 9 ff.

[4] Bröcking, p. 16 f.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 33 f.

[6] Gfrörer, *Allgem. Kirchengesch.*, iv. pt. i. 513, states that Leo dared not immediately attack the teaching of Berengar, because all the bishops of France had declared for him. But this statement is too strong.

Scot, even if he did not know Berengar's own views.[1] He was aware of the existence of heretical teaching in Gaul, and at Reims issued a general sentence of excommunication against the 'new heretics in Gaul,' and included under the ban all who received from them any payment or service, or extended to them any protection.[2] The latter prohibition was a veiled thrust at Berengar and his protectors.[3] It was aimed at the practice by which he supported poor scholars, who no doubt readily absorbed his teaching and disseminated it when they left Tours. It would convey to Henry I, Count Geoffrey, and Bishop Eusebius a hint that their patronage of the Archdeacon was not approved by the Curia. For the rest, specific action against Berengar was reserved for the coming Council at Rome, when Leo could act with more freedom, and with less serious consequences to the papal dignity, if the enmity of Berengar's powerful supporters were further aroused. With this object Lanfranc was retained in the Pope's following, and the clerk of Reims was entrusted to bring Berengar's letter to the Roman Council.[4]

---

[1] Sudendorf, p. 100, but as Schwabe says (p. 29) Sudendorf wrongly dates the letter of Eusebius Bruno (Sudendorf, pp. 202–204) 1049. It was not written till 1050–51, and so cannot be quoted in support of Leo's attitude in 1049. But this objection does not prevent Leo's general acquaintance with the question. *Cf.* Stäudlin, ii. 26; Delarc, *Rev. Quest. hist.*, xx. 129. *Cf. infra*, pp. 60 n. 5, 65.

[2] *Anselmi Hist. dedicat. Ecclesiae S. Remigii* (Migne, 142, 1437b; Bouq., xi. 523b).

[3] Delarc, *Rev. des Quest. hist.*, xx. 129 f., maintains that it is difficult to admit that Berengar's case did not come up at Reims, but that the Pope could not thoroughly sift the matter in the absence of documents. Heurtevent, p. 128 f., with caution, allows that Leo knew of Berengar's doctrine at Reims. But *cf.* p. 131 n. 4, where he says that Lanfranc's presence at Reims suggests the condemnation of Berengar's teaching there. Heurtevent (p. 131 n. 3) bases Lanfranc's presence at Reims on a letter of Lanfranc to John, Archbishop of Rouen (Migne, 150, 520c), where he refers to the consecration of a church at Remiremont. On this point *cf.* Schwabe (p. 32), who says that the consecration at Remiremont took place not in 1049, but on the second journey of Leo to France at the end of 1050.

[4] *Cf.* Milo Crispin, *Vita Lanfranci* (Migne, 150, 36a). Schwabe (p. 31) agrees that Lanfranc's presence at Rome was required by Berengar's case. But of course my sequence of events is different from that given by him. His valuable work is weakened by the consistency with which he forces all the evidence to support his thesis that Berengar's views were not known before the Roman Council of 1050. Some of the older writers give William's marriage with Matilda as the cause of Lanfranc's presence at Rome in 1050. (*Cf.* de Roye, p. 37, possibly misled by the *Chron. Bec.*, Migne, 150, 644d.) But William did not marry Matilda until 1053

The only serious objection to this sequence of events lies in Berengar's statement in his extensive apologetic work, the *De Sacra Cœna*,[1] written many years later. He there contends that at the time of the Council of Vercelli (September 1050) his views on the Eucharist were not formed.[2] But this statement must be read in the light of his letter to Ansfroi, Abbot of Préaux, written shortly before the Council of Vercelli, in which he says that his theory on the Eucharist is clear and altogether manifest to those who have eyes to see.[3] Consequently, the statement in the *De Sacra Cœna*, which was written after a long interval, when accurate recollection was difficult, can only refer to the absence of a full and reasoned explanation of his doctrine, which in 1050 had not yet been published by him. It may also be added, as Schnitzer has pointed out, that unless Berengar's views were formed at the time when his letter to Lanfranc was written, he would hardly have challenged the latter to a discussion, and so have run the risk of public blame, and of damage to his reputation as a scholar.[4] It is also difficult to see that Lanfranc's reputation could have been compromised by the letter unless public opinion was already sensitive on account of Berengar.

(Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, iii. 653 f., quoting *Chron. Turonensis*, Bouq., 348b. The *Chron. S. Martini Turon.*, *Mon. Ger. SS.*, xxvi. 460, gives 1056). Freeman's date is confirmed by a document of 1053 in which Matilda appears as the Duchess of William. (*Cf.* Bröcking, *Ergänzungsheft*, p. 8 f., correcting his *Französ. Politik Leo IX*, p. 38. He quotes Luchaire, *Rev. hist.*, 49, p. 403 n. 1, following Duhamel, *Position des Thèses de l'École des Chartes*, 1864.) Lanfranc did not open this business at Rome until 1059. Brucker, ii. 147, appears to be under the influence of the old error. He says that Lanfranc left for Rome, charged with delicate business by William, and was perhaps summoned by Leo to give an account of troubles of which Berengar was the author.

[1] Published under Neander's general editorship by A. F. and F. T. Vischer (1834). A new and more accurate edition of this valuable work is needed. Very few copies are available. I have to acknowledge the generosity of Archdeacon Lilley of Hereford for the loan of his copy.

[2] *De Sacra Cœna*, p. 44 : 'Quod sententiam meam scribis Vercellis in concessu illo expositam, dico de rei veritate et testimonio conscientiae meae, nullum eo tempore sententiam meam exposuisse, quia nec mihi eo tempore tanta perspicuitate constabat, quia nondum tanta pro veritate eo tempore perpessus, nondum tam diligenti in scripturis consideratione sategeram.'

[3] Sudendorf, p. 209 : 'Res enim eminet et est in evidenti omnino, si quis oculos habeat,' etc.

[4] *Berengar von Tours*, p. 18.

CHAPTER IV

THE COUNCIL OF ROME (1050)

At the Synod of Reims (October 3–6, 1049) Leo IX had summoned Geoffrey Martel to appear at the next synod to be opened at Mainz on October 19, and warned him that unless Gervase, the Bishop of Le Mans,[1] had been set at liberty by that date, excommunication would fall on the Count.[2] Geoffrey failed to appear at Mainz, and there the Pope excommunicated him, placed his territories under an interdict,[3] and summoned him to appear at the Council of Rome or Vercelli to be held the next year.[4] The Roman

---

[1] The cause of Gervase's imprisonment is not known. The case is discussed by Schwabe, p. 36 ff. Another cause of dispute between Pope and Count was the appointment of a successor to the Bishop of Nantes, deposed by Leo at Reims (*ibid.* p. 35).

[2] *Anselmi Hist. dedic. Eccles. S. Rem.* (Migne, 142, 1437c). Schwabe, p. 36 n. 1, thinks that the time allowed for the release of the Bishop was too short. Bröcking, p. 34 n. 2, does not agree. *Cf.* Halphen, p. 120; Sudendorf, p. 122.

[3] In his letter to Leo IX, Geoffrey complained that he and his lands had been placed under the ban before his case had been heard (Sudendorf, p. 213). Eusebius Bruno also complained of the interdict (*ibid.* p. 202). Gregory VII in later years alluded to it: *Narratio Controversiae* (Bouquet, xii. 460b). Loofs, p. 568, states that a 'cessatio' (*cf.* Wetzer and Welte, *Kirchenlexicon*, iii. (1880) 30 f.), not an interdict, was declared. Bröcking, p. 100, following *Anselmi Hist. dedic. Eccles. S. Rem.*, dates the interdict at the Synod of Mainz (Nov. 1049), discounting the statement in the *Chron. S. Maxentii* (Marchegay, p. 398), which places it in 1050, and is followed by Schwabe, p. 45, who dates it at the beginning of 1050. Halphen, p. 121 n. 3, thinks it may have been fulminated at Mainz, or some weeks later, or at the beginning of 1050. Brucker, ii. 164, dates both excommunication and interdict between the Councils of Rome and Vercelli. He says that the Abbey of Marmoutier was exempt.

[4] Letter of Euseb. Bruno (Sudendorf, p. 203). Bröcking, p. 38 n. 1, 100, 106, holds that the statement in the letter does not mean that Geoffrey had the choice between Rome and Vercelli, but that Eusebius either did not know, or did not accurately report, the terms of the Pope's citation. But this view is hardly justified. Halphen, p. 122, accepts the statement of Eusebius as it stands.

Council assembled on April 29, 1050.[1] Three French archbishops, five bishops, and seven abbots appeared,[2] a fact which illustrates the growing influence of the Papacy and the effect produced in France by the Synod of Reims.[3] Geoffrey again was absent, but his ambassador Eusebius represented him, with the express purpose of securing the removal of the interdict.

Leo IX again dealt warily with the French bishops. Hugh of Langres was restored to his episcopate.[4] Guy, Archbishop of Reims, who had survived a charge of simony at Reims, again escaped without condemnation.[5] But Leo did not modify his attitude towards Geoffrey: he rather sharpened it. Eusebius failed to secure the removal of the interdict, and a direct blow was aimed at Geoffrey and Eusebius by the condemnation of their protégé Berengar.[1] By the same action a shaft was aimed at William of Normandy.[2] At Reims Leo IX had forbidden his marriage with Matilda, the daughter of Baldwin of Flanders, and although the union had not yet taken place,[3] no gesture of submission had been made by the Duke.[4] If Lanfranc could be involved in the charge against Berengar, so that he together with the Scolasticus of Tours could be condemned, a check similar to that administered to Count Geoffrey would be offered to the Norman Duke. Consequently Leo had more than one reason for keeping Lanfranc near him from October 1049 to September 1050.[5] But the Prior of Bec, the old lawyer of Pavia who had won such triumphs in the Pavian courts in early days that the prestige of the older practitioners was lowered,[6] was more than a match for this kind of intrigue. In all his long career he was never caught napping when an opportunity for skilful debate and for the advocate's ingenuity was provided. Unlike Berengar and Thomas of York,[7] whom the former resembled, Lanfranc never lost his head.

---

[1] Jaffé–Wattenbach, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, 4213. *La Vérité hist.*, iii. 247, corrects Sudendorf, p. 95, who puts the Council of Rome in the middle of April, and suggests May 2 as the date when the Council, which had assembled at the end of April, opened its session. On the Council *cf.* Héfélé–Leclercq, iv. pt. ii. 1040–1055; Brucker, ii. 114–125; Mansi, xix. 759–772; Mabillon, *Annales*, iv. 511, 538.

[2] Brucker, p. 114. As the Council numbered fifty-three bishops, the proportion of French bishops was small. Of the rest, most were Italians. Two came from England—Herman and Ealdred (*A.S. Chron.* E. an. 1047), one from Lorraine, and none from Germany. A large proportion of the thirty-five abbots was French. *Cf.* Mabillon, *Annales*, iv. 511 f.

[3] Bröcking, p. 40. The presence of French bishops cannot be interpreted as an indication of the spread of Berengar's views in France as *La Vérité hist.*, iii. 242, alleges. The Council handled other business, more important for the Papacy, than Berengar's case.

[4] *Cf. supra*, p. 52 n. 1.

[5] Delarc, *Rev. des Quest. hist.*, xx. 122 ff.; Schwabe, pp. 46–50; Bröcking, p. 47 f. The letter of Eusebius (Sudendorf, p. 202 ff.) was written to Archbishop Guy of Reims, and not to Arnulf, Archbishop of Tours, as Sudendorf (pp. 92–100) maintained. It was addressed to a bishop who had been at Rome, and this we do not read of Arnulf. At this same Council a dispute with the Breton bishops was settled in Arnulf's favour. Moreover, it was not necessary to acquaint Arnulf with the facts so strongly stressed in Eusebius' letter. Geoffrey had appealed to Arnulf when the interdict was declared (Sudendorf, p. 213), and Geoffrey would not have asked that Arnulf, his own Archbishop, be sent to Rome to judge his case. The term ' primatus ' suited Guy better than Arnulf. Sudendorf, p. 92 ff., dates this letter June 1049; *La Vérité hist.*, iii. 260, beginning of 1050; Schwabe, pp. 39–45, beginning of 1051, and was followed by Bröcking, p. 101 ff., but in his *Ergänzungsheft*, p. 13, Bröcking abandoned this date for the summer of 1050. Halphen, p. 123 n. 3, cannot decide between 1050 and 1051; Loofs, p. 569, places it between the Councils of Rome and Vercelli. He accepts Schwabe's conclusions on this letter with reserve (p. 566). If Guy were present at Rome, why should Eusebius write to him? (p. 567). Drehman, p. 20, says that although Guy was summoned to Rome, he did not appear. Drehman's hint reconciles Loofs and Schwabe, for if Eusebius knew that Guy did not intend to appear, the contents of the letter fall into place.

The Curia staged its programme well. The letter of Berengar to Lanfranc,[8] with which the Prior now became acquainted for the first time, was read out in the full assembly of the Roman Council by the clerk from Reims. As Lanfranc alleged, its terms cast suspicion upon him,[9] and Berengar showed a lack of knowledge of human nature when he, in later years, disputed Lanfranc's assertion.[1] The fact that the incriminating document was produced by an ecclesiastic from Reims was sufficient to alarm a sharper head than Lanfranc's. Had the letter arrived during the Synod of Reims? And if so, how far had its contents now been spread by the distinguished clergy from western Europe who had assembled there?[2] A formal sentence of condemnation and excommunication upon Berengar was passed,[3] and then Leo commanded that Lanfranc should rise and wipe off the blot of this base rumour—expound his belief and prove it rather by reference to sacred authorities than by argument. Was the Pope's conduct of the case inspired by an arrière-pensée?[4] If not, the letter should have been read to the Council by him to whom it was addressed. The Prior met the emergency with lawyer-like skill. 'I arose, what I thought I said, what I said I proved, what I proved gave satisfaction to all and displeased none.'[5] This is the voice, at any rate, of Cæsar, and the attack on William through Lanfranc collapsed, while the situation ended in complete defeat for Eusebius Bruno and his patron Count Geoffrey. Berengar was cited to appear at the autumn Council at Vercelli, and Eusebius could secure no more than some modification of the terms of the interdict, while the demand that Geoffrey must appear before the Pope was again issued.[6]

---

[1] Bröcking, p. 53 f.

[2] Gfrörer, *Greg. VII*, iii. 272, says that Leo IX sought to embroil Henry I with William, and Berengar with Lanfranc, in order to check Henry's scheme, which was supported by Berengar, for the creation of a French national church, a scheme which had the support of Ferdinand of Castile and Leon. Ferdinand had set up Cresconius of Ivrea or Compostella as a Castilian Pope, and Henry I proposed to set up Guy of Reims in a similar capacity.

[3] *Cf. supra*, p. 57 n. 4.

[4] But Ébersolt, p. 31, exaggerates when he says that William supported Berengar because the Pope refused the dispensation for the marriage. Why, then, should William oppose Berengar at Brionne as Ébersolt admits?

[5] Bröcking, p. 59. Leo had adopted Lanfranc's attitude to Berengar.

[6] Macdonald, p. 5 ff.

[7] *Ibid.* pp. 83, 91.

[8] Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 13, doubts whether the letter read at Rome was one we possess. The point is discussed by *La Vérité hist.*, iii. 243; Héfélé-Leclercq, iv. pt. ii. 1049 with notes 1-2; Schnitzer, p. 26 f.; Will, i. 62. But there is proof that two letters were written; *cf.* Heurtevent, p. 130 n. 1.

[9] Migne, 150, 413a; Milo Crispin (Migne, 150, 36a).

That Berengar was being used as a stalking-horse for papal action against Geoffrey of Anjou is indicated by the fact that he himself was not summoned to Rome for this occasion, and by the fact that he was condemned unheard. Of this procedure he naturally complained with sarcasm. Lanfranc's report of the Council, said he, shed the aspersion of sacrilege upon the holy Leo. Human as well as divine law prohibited the condemnation of anyone unheard. The blessed Gregory had said that he deprived himself of the power of binding and loosing, who exercised it, not against the behaviour of his subordinates, but to indulge his own wilful caprice. Until Leo, by citing him, had tested whether he would appear or not, sentence should have been suspended, and the falseness of Lanfranc's charge, that his belief was contrary to the common faith, would have been recognised.[1]

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 36. Delarc, *Rev. des Quest. hist.*, xx. 133, agrees that Berengar's comment was fair.

[2] *Anselmi Hist. dedic. Eccles. S. Rem.* (Migne, 142, 1425a–b) reports that clergy from France, England, Scotland, and Spain were present.

[3] Lanfranc (Migne, 150, 413b); Bernold of Constance (Migne 148, 1453b).

[4] If Lanfranc's account may be trusted. It is regarded by Lessing, pp. 97, 117, 120, as mendacious; by Schwabe, p. 30 ff., as only partly trustworthy.

[5] Migne, 150, 413b. Delarc, *Rev. des Quest. hist.*, xx. 132, holds that Berengar's letter contained sufficient to justify his condemnation.

[6] Letter of Eusebius Bruno (Sudendorf, p. 202): 'Ibi, cum edicti illius, quod utinam ab apostolic sede ad quamlibet ecclesiam nunquam exisset, inmoderantiam, sed non quantum debuit, temperasset, locum, tempus constituit,' etc.

Throughout the long dispute, and especially at this stage, Berengar did not realise the extent to which he was being made the tool of ecclesiastical policy and political intrigue, both by the Papacy and by his own patrons. It was quite contrary to the procedure of the Curia at that day to condemn a man unheard, but the incident fits in with the political expediency of Leo's opportunist policy, which was so clearly revealed at Reims. At the Council of Rome the Pope had weightier matters in mind than the heresy of Berengar. The postponement of a final settlement to the Council of Vercelli was also partly related to the affairs of Count Geoffrey. If Geoffrey had appeared and given satisfaction to Leo at Rome, the verdict against Berengar might not have been issued.

On the other hand, if the outbreak of the Berengarian controversy was thus made use of in the hostile attitude of Anjou to the Papacy, there is little justification for the contention that Berengar obtained the vital power for his steady heresy from the political opposition of his countrymen,[2] that the anti-papal tendency of the second eucharistic controversy was the principal result of the interdict placed on Anjou and Touraine,[3] and that Berengar was the arch-plotter who quietly schemed behind the walls of S. Martin's [1] a great anti-papal, anti-imperialist combination, which was to include not only the Count of Anjou, but the King of France and the Duke of Normandy. In his long polemical treatise and throughout his correspondence Berengar shows a singular lack of political knowledge, or insight, or even interest. In the former he never refers to the great political personages with whom he came in contact. The dispute was for him a theological controversy simply. This made him an easy opponent for astute politicians like Lanfranc and Humbert, and his lack of a political sense made it easy for patrons like Henry I and Eusebius Bruno to drop him when he was no longer useful for their aims.

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 37. *Cf.* Heurtevent, p. 134 f., who thinks that the Pope's action was not irregular.

[2] Schwabe, p. 59.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 58. The reviewer of Schwabe's book in the *Historische Zeitschrift*, lix. (1888) 535, rightly says that this is too pointed. Bröcking, p. 58 and n. 4, regards it as too ingenious. Bröcking presents the best account of the relations with Anjou.

Some of the confusion surrounding the affairs of Berengar at this period arises from the divided loyalties which the feudal organisation of Church and State imposed upon many individuals in those days. If Berengar was a factor in the contest between the Papacy and Anjou, he occupied a similar rôle, though with even less happy consequences for himself, in the parallel battle of wits and policies being carried on between the Papacy and the Emperor Henry III on the one side, and Henry I of France on the other. Gfrörer has revealed the steps by which the Emperor attempted to establish imperial influence over the great magnates of France. If the Emperor gave his support to the schemes of Leo IX, German interests had everything to gain, although the independence of Leo was greater than Gfrörer allows. Moreover, Gfrörer stresses too strongly the part played by Berengar in the effort of Henry I of France to counter the encroachment of imperial-papal politics in France, by attempting to supply, in obedience to the royal wishes, a dogmatic basis for a French national Protestant church, or at least to create a kind of Gallicanism.[2]

---

[1] Schwabe, p. 58.

[2] *Allgemeine Kirchengeschichte*, iv, pt. i, 508 ff., and *Papst Gregorius VII*, i, 600. Gfrörer maintains that a similar movement was in vogue in Spain (*Greg. VII*, iii, 272, iv, 143, vi, 619) and at Milan and Bremen (*Allgem. Kirchengesch.* iv, pt. i, 560). Henry I aimed at persuading Duke William to adopt Berengar's teaching, so that William's influence at Rome would be neutralised. Thus Berengar was sent to Normandy to convert the Norman clergy and wrote to Lanfranc with the same view (*Greg. VII*, vi, 620).

The authorities in Anjou continued, after the Council of Rome, to give their support to Berengar. In a letter written some months later to Guy, Archbishop of Reims, Eusebius complained of the ill-treatment of Berengar by the Pope. Although entirely free from error and fault, ' this clerk of our Church ' had been most unjustly and unworthily defamed by the apostolic chair. Eusebius would have written at greater length about Berengar if the bearer of the letter could have tarried longer.[1] But the failure of his powerful friends, Count Geoffrey and Bishop Eusebius, to ward off the papal attack of Rome in the spring of 1050 caused him to look around for increased support and ampler protection, although we cannot see in this obvious step the attempt to take a leading part in the great combinations outlined by Schwabe[2] and Gfrörer. If Berengar had been capable of so masterly a stroke he would not have been so easily overcome at later stages of the controversy. That a political movement was soon inaugurated at Angers in order to obtain allies outside Anjou against the Papacy, after the failure of Bishop Eusebius to get the interdict rescinded, is proved by the letter of Eusebius to Guy, Archbishop of Reims,[3] in which the Bishop attempted, though unsuccessfully, to secure the chief Primate of France[4] for the combination, and the impression that Eusebius, rather than Berengar, was regarded at this time as the chief agent of political schemes in Anjou is confirmed by the fact that the French clergy looked to Eusebius rather than to Berengar as the chief representative of the heretical eucharistic teaching.[5]

---

[1] Sudendorf, p. 204.

[2] Loofs, p. 570 f., declines to admit the political character of Berengar's journey, outlined by Schwabe (p. 60 f.), for in this case Berengar would not have attempted to go to Vercelli in the following autumn.

[3] Sudendorf, p. 202 ff. *Cf. supra*, p. 60 n. 5, for the date.

[4] *Cf.* Hinschius, i. 597–621, on the primacy in France, Germany, England, Scotland, and Ireland. The primacy can be traced in France at Bourges in the ninth century. The idea was foreign to the conceptions of the eighth century, and first appears in the forged decretals of the ninth century. Hincmar (843–882) set up the claim for Reims. The institution had no constitutional right behind it, but was a practical fact. On the question in England, *cf.* Macdonald, pp. 70–94, 270–291.

[5] Schwabe, p. 58 f., quoting the letter of Theoduin of Liège (Migne, 146, 1439b). *Cf.* Durand of Troarn (Migne, 149, 1422d), and the letter of Cardinal Humbert (*Neues Archiv*, vii. 614 ; Brucker, ii. 393 ff., with French translation, p. 143 ff.).

A humbler and much more probable rôle must be attributed to Berengar. He began his tour with the object of securing fresh support for his teaching, especially in view of the condemnation issued against him at Rome.[1] The reports which have survived show that Berengar's theological views were the subject of discussions during this journey, and they contain no reference to contemporary politics.

He first visited Préaux in Normandy, where his friend Ansfroi was Abbot.[2] The esteem in which Berengar held Ansfroi is revealed in the letter which he afterwards wrote to him from Chartres. 'There is nothing either splendid or divine which I can say, as I have no authority or dignity or merit, if it be not sanctioned by your authority, which seems to dwell in heaven.'[3] Ansfroi had already heard of Berengar's condemnation at Rome through Richer, Abbot of S. Julian at Tours, who had returned from the Council,[4] and possibly for this reason Berengar failed to convince Ansfroi of the merits of his teaching. He had a long conversation with the Abbot in his cell 'concerning the question, yea it is not a question, for the thing is altogether clear, if anyone has the eyes not of a beast, but of a man, eyes capable of bearing light, not accustomed to be bound by darkness.'[5] He continues: 'I listened to you on the question, and I had your advice that I should turn to the statements of the gospel and apostles. I was greatly amazed, and did not presume to claim for my stupidity a more vigilant knowledge of the gospel and apostolic sayings, as if my perspicacity ought to have pronounced more mildly concerning either.'[6]

---

[1] Schnitzer, p. 30 f., adopts the same view of this journey.

[2] Durand (Migne, 149, 1422 d); 'Epis. of Berengar to Ansfroi' (Sudendorf, p. 208 ff.).

[3] Sudendorf, p. 210.

[4] Ibid. p. 209. From Berengar's statement Richer seems to have made mischief between him and Ansfroi. In the D. S. C., p. 30, Berengar says that he himself had heard of the decision at Rome through those who had been present at the Council.

[5] So Berengar's views had been formed before the Council of Vercelli.

[6] 'Epis. of Berengar to Ansfroi' (Sudendorf, p. 208 ff.). On the date cf. infra, p. 77, n. 1. Brucker (ii. 153, n. 1) without justification says that this letter was written to Albert, Abbot of Marmoutier. He thinks (p. 150) that the visit to Normandy was inspired by Lanfranc's absence and by Berengar's desire to make use of the inexperienced young Duke whom he believed to be ill disposed towards Rome on the marriage

So Berengar left Préaux without winning the support of Ansfroi.[1] He next visited William the young Duke of Normandy,[2] and as we read that Berengar hastened to him, it is probable that William appeared suddenly in the neighbourhood of Préaux,[3] and that the Scolasticus hastily seized the opportunity of an interview. William acted cautiously. He retained Berengar with him until he could summon an assembly of the clergy of Normandy in order to examine the theological teaching of his visitor. Brionne, in the centre of Normandy, was chosen as a convenient place for the discussion, which took place the day after the leading clergy had arrived. Berengar relied upon the eloquence of a certain clerk, whom he took with him, to convince the assembly.[4] But he and his supporter were reduced to silence, though it is doubtful whether an orthodox statement was extracted from them as Durand says.[5] The appeal to William ended without any useful result

---

question. Gfrörer, *Kirchengesch.*, iv. pt. i. 534, thinks that it was to stave off an attack of the French orthodox party upon Henry I, about to be headed by William.

[1] Durand had the account soon after from William himself (Migne, 149, 1421d). Schwabe, p. 57, who rightly refuses to accept Durand's chronology, agrees that his sequence of events is trustworthy. Lessing, p. 133 f., declines the account of Durand as mendacious. Durand assigns the events of 1050 to 1053. Cossart (Mansi, xix. 775a f.) thought Durand had used the Roman enumeration ML, and that a copyist had changed the date to MLIII. But Mabillon (*Vetera Analecta*, p. 513) had seen an old MS., which he thought might have been Durand's, in which the date was written with 'tertio' abbreviated to 't'tio.' Cf. *La Vérité hist.*, iii. 238. But the statement on the foundation of the Abbey of Préaux must be supplemented by Böhmer (*Kirche und Staat*, p. 7 n. 2, quoting *Gallia Christiana*, xi., *Instrument*, p. 199 ff.), who dates it 1040. Ellies-Dupin, p. 22, noticed Durand's error, yet Gfrörer, *Greg. VII*, iii. 274, repeats Durand's date.

[2] Durand (Migne, 149, 1421d).

[3] *Ibid.* 1421d; Heurtevent, p. 138 f.

[4] Sudendorf, p. 115 (followed by Schnitzer, p. 32 n. 2), doubts Durand's statement concerning the eloquent clerk, on the ground that Drogo of Paris (Sudendorf, p. 200) sufficiently proves that Berengar could rely on his own eloquence.

[5] Migne, 149, 1422a. The question of Lanfranc's presence at Brionne has been discussed at length in my *Lanfranc*, p. 45 n. 7. The statements of Berengar (*D.S.C.*, pp. 37, 38, 43) refer to an informal gathering of Norman clergy at Brionne after Lanfranc's return from Vercelli, and not to the assembly convened by William. It is only necessary to add that the attempt of Heurtevent (p. 139 n. 2, 3) to prove that Berengar was challenging the accuracy of Lanfranc's statements is not proved. The words 'Tempore enim, quo te Vercellis affuisse scripsisti' (*D.S.C.*, p. 39) clearly refer to the incident of the Bishop of Vercelli, and do not refer to the time when the Council at Brionne took place. They cannot be quoted

for Berengar, and in place of securing for him the support of the powerful Norman Duke, his cause had been publicly damaged in the eyes of all Normandy before a regularly convened ecclesiastical assembly.[1] The report of Lanfranc's action at Rome had been brought to Berengar's notice by Richer, and if we are to interpret the visit of Berengar to Normandy not merely as an attempt to counter Lanfranc's procedure but also as a thrust at his adversary there, then that project also miscarried.

From Brionne Berengar travelled to Chartres, on the way to Paris. Here his case, the news of which had spread far and wide,[2] caused excitement among the clergy of Chartres when they heard that he was coming to the city. They challenged him to a public discussion, and allowed themselves to be led into tumultuous behaviour by a clerk whom Berengar does not name, but whom he describes as a most disgraceful person, a vile buffoon who had lost his reputation with the bishops, a man of no credit, whose testimony no secular court would receive. ‘ Where is the honour of the Church, where is the sun of righteousness when such a standard bearer is allowed to take up ecclesiastical business ? ’ This man headed a mob of illiterates and came to Berengar ‘ as if with sticks and staves.’ [3]

---

against Lanfranc's account of the course of events. Delarc, *Rev. des Questions hist.*, xx. 148, dates Brionne after Vercelli. Brucker, ii. 105, makes the ingenious suggestion that ‘ apud Brionnum ’ in Berengar's account is a slip for ‘ apud Turonum.’ Brucker suggests that Lanfranc was at the Synod of Tours of 1050–51, after Vercelli. His hypothesis gets rid of the difficulties in the conflicting accounts of Berengar and Lanfranc. Schwabe, p. 61, cannot decide whether Brionne should be dated before or after Vercelli.

[1] It is possible that policy did not influence Berengar's action at all during this period. The visit to Ansfroi may well have been a step to secure private counsel from a friend whose advice he could trust. The visit to William may have been no more than an impulsive act, consequent upon the Duke's sudden appearance in the neighbourhood. The visit to Henry I need have been no more than an application for a safe-conduct to Italy. There is much in the *De Sacra Cœna* to show that Berengar's political behaviour was unsophisticated. On the other hand his letters show that he realised the value of influential friends. *Cf.* ‘ Epis. to Richard ’ and ‘ Epis. of Frollant ’ (*infra*, pp. 90 f., 117). Lessing, p. 143, regards the reports of the Norman journey as fictitious.

[2] Durand (Migne, 149, 1422b).

[3] *Ibid.* 1422b. Schwabe, p. 64, suggests that he may have been the William mentioned in Berengar's letter to Ascelin (*cf. infra*, p. 69), but this is only a little less improbable than Sudendorf's suggestion (p. 106) that he may have been the Arnulf mentioned in this letter.

Berengar intended to pass through Chartres without discussing his teaching with the clergy there, partly because he hoped soon to discuss it before the bishops at Vercelli, and partly because there was scarcely anyone at Chartres who was worthy of a hearing. On the other hand, if there were some among the clergy there who were not to be despised, as the event proved, the matter could hardly be satisfactorily treated on a mere journey through the city.[1] Indeed, the presence of two or three reputable people, including William the Provost,[2] Arnulf the Precentor of Chartres,[3] and his friend Ascelin,[4] compelled Berengar to speak, although he avoided so far as possible ' giving what was holy to the dogs, and did not concede anything to them,' [5] even when, in the midst of the tumult, Arnulf secured silence, and said that Ansfroi, the Abbot of Préaux, had expressed agreement with the opinions of the mob. On his own account Arnulf attempted to show that Ansfroi had the support of Scripture and was not influenced by other authorities.[6] Berengar thereupon brought the affair to an end

---

If a choice has to be made between the two, Berengar's words apply to William better. But would he have occupied space with reporting the opinions of the leader of the mob ? Schwabe rightly dismisses Sudendorf's suggestion that some of the bishops had stirred up the unnamed man and the mob.

[1] ' Epis. to Ansfroi ' (Sudendorf, p. 209); ' Epis. of Ascelin ' (Migne, 150, 66a–c).

[2] ' Epis. to Ascelin ' (Migne, 150, 66b) ; ' Epis. of Ascelin to Berengar ' (Migne, 150, 67a). Heurtevent, p. 142 (quoting Clerval, p. 65 f.), and Schnitzer, p. 36, report that William was Provost of Chartres.

[3] ' Epis. of Ascelin ' (Migne, 150, 68c) : ' Arnulfus cantor.' *Cf.* ' Epis. to Ascelin ' (Migne, 150, 66d).

[4] Epis. of Berengar to Ascelin and of Ascelin to Berengar.

[5] Schwabe, p. 63, denies that the clergy of Chartres were hostile to Berengar, and refers to the letter of Ascelin (Migne, 150, 67 f.), and Berengar's letter to Drogo (Sudendorf, p. 215, dated 1054). But although a Chartrain, Ascelin was a personal friend of Berengar, and so would not be included within the latter's condemnation of the clergy of Chartres. Berengar admits the presence of one or two worthy people. If Berengar appeals to the Bishop of Chartres in the letter to Drogo, that cannot affect the situation in 1050, for between 1048 and 1052 there was no Bishop of Chartres (Sudendorf, p. 106), and Agobart, who is the Bishop referred to by Berengar in that letter, was not elected till 1052 (*Gallia Christiana*, viii. 1120a). Heurtevent, p. 143, describes the incident at Chartres as an orderly deputation to Berengar, headed by William, Arnulf and Ascelin and a number of other scholars! On the identity of these three clergy *cf.* Sudendorf, p. 15 ff. ; Heurtevent, p. 142 n. 4.

[6] ' Epis. to Ansfroi ' (Sudendorf, p. 209). Sudendorf, p. 104, says that Ansfroi came to Chartres and called an inquiry together. So also Delarc, *Rev. des Questions hist.*, xx. 134, and Heurtevent, p. 143. But

by promising to write formally to the clergy of Chartres, explaining his views, a promise which he faithfully kept.[1]

The more private discussion [2] which followed appears to have been instigated by Ascelin,[3] for in his letter, sent shortly after to Berengar, when the latter was in confinement, Ascelin admitted the prudence with which Berengar had acted on this occasion. The Provost William gave expression to a statement which Berengar entirely misunderstood. He said that every Christian man at Easter should communicate at the Lord's Table, save those who had committed a crime which had not been confessed.[4] Berengar, possibly during a noisy interruption, understood him to mean that all men, whether Christian or not,[5] should communicate at Easter, and this, Ascelin admitted, would have been sacrilege, as Berengar alleged.[6] Nor was this the only misunderstanding created on that excitable occasion. Ascelin discoursed at some length on the doctrine of the Eucharist. He said that the bread and wine on the altar became, through the ministry of the priest and by the power of the Holy Spirit, the true body and true blood of Christ, as the Scripture clearly proved, but that John the Scot taught that the true body and blood of Christ are not consecrated on the altar, and that the latter basely tried to prove his contention from the writings of the Fathers, especially from the passage of Gregorian Sacramentary : ' O ! Lord, we beseech thee, may thy sacraments achieve in us what they contain, that what we now handle in form (specie) we may hold in reality (veritate) '—meaning according to John the Scot, but contrary to our Faith, that the sacraments ' are retained in form and not in reality.' [7] Berengar did not deny this, but said that he had not read John's ' little work ' from beginning to end, although what he had read was in agreement with those writers whom he had mentioned

---

Berengar's letter to Ansfroi precludes this. Schwabe, p. 64, shows that Sudendorf was misled by a wrong translation of ' te in vulgus prodesse apud eos.'

[1] Durand, 149, 1422b.

[2] *Ibid.* Durand says that Berengar made no reply to the clergy of Chartres but promised to do so at a convenient opportunity.

[3] ' Epis. of Ascelin ' (Migne, 150, 67b).

[4] ' Epis. of Ascelin ' (Migne, 150, 67a–b).

[5] ' Epis. to Ascelin ' (Migne, 150, 66a–b).

[6] ' Epis. of Ascelin ' (Migne, 150, 67a).

[7] ' Epis. of Ascelin ' (Migne, 150, 67b–c).

in his letter to Lanfranc, and if John were regarded as a heretic they also should come under the same condemnation. For the rest, if he should find anything in John's book not sufficiently defined, he was ready to admit it.[1] The Provost William, at the conference, apparently interpreted Berengar's silence, when Ascelin quoted John the Scot, to indicate assent to John's teaching, and afterwards William boasted that Berengar could not deny that John was a heretic.[2]

Two other points were then submitted to Berengar, possibly by Arnulf,[3] which the former was alleged to have maintained. Firstly, that the words of institution by our Lord prove that the material bread is not wanting in the Sacrament. Secondly, that the episcopal office does not involve a cure of souls. Berengar admitted the first charge, but denied that he had maintained the second point, and agreed that the episcopal office carried with it the cure of souls.[4] The conference closed with an appeal by Arnulf to Berengar that he would leave them to believe that in which they felt secure, he expressed good wishes for Berengar's salvation, and begged that neither he nor his friends would attempt to alter the way which their doctors, so holy, so wise, and so Catholic, showed to be so right, so definite and so well worn, that no one who held to it could deviate, and no one who did not hold to it could fail to wander.[5] Berengar appears to have promised to communicate with them at a convenient opportunity.[6]

His disinclination for delay at Chartres was doubtless influenced by the desire to secure as quickly as possible the support of Henry I of France. This was the more necessary after the disappointment at Brionne; moreover, the summer was passing away, and he was due at Vercelli by September.[7]

---

[1] 'Epis. of Ascelin' (Migne, 150, 67b–c); 'Epis. to Ascelin' (Migne, 150, 66b–c).

[2] 'Epis. to Ascelin' (Migne, 150, 66b).

[3] 'vir optimus' (Migne, 150, 66c). He is cordially mentioned by Berengar at the end of his letter, and is the last name referred to by Ascelin.

[4] 'Epis. to Ascelin' (Migne, 150, 66c).

[5] 'Epis. of Ascelin' (Migne, 150, 68c); 'Epis. to Ascelin' (Migne, 150, 66d).

[6] Durand (Migne, 149, 1422b).

[7] *Ibid.* 1422b–c. *Cf.* Berengar's letter to Ansfroi (Sudendorf, p. 209). Durand wrongly dates the visit to Ansfroi, the meeting at Brionne, and the journey through Chartres in 1053. He has been followed by

His friends tried to persuade him not to go to Vercelli, on the canonical ground, as he says, that no cleric was amenable to a jurisdiction outside his own province.[1] Behind this advice we may see the influence of Bishop Eusebius, Count Geoffrey, and other friends in Anjou, who were unwilling to afford any further opportunity for the Papacy to interfere in Angevine affairs ; or possibly the clergy of S. Martin's at Tours, who were not observing the terms of the interdict imposed by the Papacy on Anjou and Touraine,[2] may have advised him not to place himself within the power of the authority which had imposed the interdict. However, Berengar says that moved by deference for the apostolical dignity he determined to go.[3] In order to be sure that he would not be arrested while in Rome he applied to the King for a safe-conduct.[4] The permission of the King to attend a tribunal outside the area of the royal jurisdiction was not a regulation confined to France at that time ; William made a similar rule to control the journeys of English barons and bishops overseas.[5] But a peculiar relationship existed between Henry I and Berengar. Henry was by ancient French custom the titular Abbot of S. Martin's,[6]

Gfrörer (*Allgemeine Kirchengeschichte*, iv. pt. i. 587) and Höfler (ii. 112 n. 75 ; *cf*. p. 180). Durand's chronology is discussed at length by Sudendorf, p. 28 ff., but I have not followed Sudendorf's chronological sequence (p. 31 f.) for the events of 1050. This is discussed by Schnitzer, p. 33 n. 1. *Cf*. Sudendorf, pp. 11 ff., 103–115. Heurtevent, p. 150 n. 1, admits that Durand received his information at second or third hand.

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 41. Will, i. 74 n. 26, says this is pure chimæra.

[2] Bouq., xii. 460 f. (*Narrat. Controv.*). *Cf*. Loofs, p. 568.

[3] *D.S.C.*, p. 41 f. Bröcking, p. 56 f., asserts that Berengar's surrender of the right to be judged in France indicates the growth of papal influence in that country. He also notes that Berengar does not speak of reverence for Leo IX, but for the Roman bishop. Brucker, ii. 151, thinks that Berengar did not intend to go to Vercelli, and (p. 153) if he was imprisoned by Henry I he was released in time to attend the Council if he desired.

[4] *D.S.C.*, p. 42 : 'ut irem securius, ad regem Franciae . . . accesseram.' Schwabe, p. 60, doubts Berengar's account of his own motives. The visit to Normandy and Henry I was for the purpose of linking up 'parallel interests,' *i.e.* parallel with those of Anjou.

[5] Macdonald, p. 218.

[6] *D.S.C.*, p. 42 : 'ad regem Franciae, ecclesiae cujus eram clericus abbatem, accesseram' ; *ibid*. p. 47 : 'hunc clerus ille beati Martini, cum me gregis sui rex ille Franciae.' Lessing, p. 126 f., assigned a general oversight of the abbeys of France to the King. Stäudlin, ii. 5, corrected this view, but misled by the words 'abbatis majoris monasterii Alberti' (*D.S.C.*, p. 52), which he translated 'of the Abbot of the great monastery of S. Albert' (p. 47), he transferred the name of Abbot Albert of Marmoutier

to a monastery of S. Albert, which did not exist. Sudendorf (pp. 105, 152 f., 172) corrected this error, but fell into another, when he applied the designation ' S. Martin's ' to the Abbey of Marmoutier, of which, he says, Henry was Abbot and Berengar was a Canon. He makes the confusion worse by saying that Berengar was also Scolasticus and Chancellor of the cathedral church (Domkirche) at Tours (p. 153). But Berengar had no connection with the Abbey of Marmoutier or with the cathedral church. He was a Canon of S. Martin's, the collegiate church of Tours. Of this church the King was Abbot by an ancient tradition. *La Vérité hist.*, iii. 177 ff., corrects Sudendorf. Yet the careful Schwabe (p. 103 f.) falls into the same trap and confuses S. Martin's and Marmoutier. Loofs, p. 575 ff., draws attention to Schwabe's slip and shows that Berengar was not a Canon of S. Martin's ' Cathedral,' but a member of the collegiate church of S. Martin, which was built at the tomb of S. Martin, 550 paces from the town, in the time of Gregory the Great, quoting Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Francorum*, ii. 14 (Migne, 71, 212a f.), and *Gallia Christiana*, xiv. 152; *cf.* Besse, p. 2. This church, which was erected originally by S. Brice over the tomb of S. Martin, was rebuilt by S. Perpet (470) and again by Herveus (1001). Loofs points out that the ' ecclesia beati Martini ' mentioned by Eusebius (Sudendorf, p. 222) was the cathedral. We may add that this is indicated by the fact that Eusebius also calls it ' ecclesia Turonensis ' (*ibid.*), the current designation of the leading church of a cathedral city, a designation which he clinches by also referring to it as ' matri nostrae ecclesiae Turonensis ' (*ibid.* p. 223), *i.e.* the metropolitan church of Tours. Bartholomew refers simply to ' the church ' (' ecclesiæ,' *ibid.* p. 221), and his reference to the canons' houses means the dwellings of the canons of the cathedral, not of S. Martin's collegiate church. The cathedral was named after S. Maurice (*cf. infra,* p. 110 n. 4). For the history of the fabric of S. Martin's, *cf.* Vaucelle, pp. 383–396. Most of the authorities clearly report Berengar as a Canon of Tours, and this can only refer to the collegiate foundation. In his writings Berengar refers to his fellow-clergy as canons, not monks: ' Epis. to Joscelin ' (Sudendorf, p. 230), ' canonicus noster '; *D.S.C.*, p. 46, ' concanonicus.' In the ' Epis. to Philip of France ' (Sudendorf, p. 226) he distinguishes between ' monastici ' and ' canonici.'

Much of this confusion would have been avoided if Mabillon's statement in the *Annales* had been noticed. He quotes (ii. 658, 746) documents dated January 1 of the sixth year of Charles the Bald, showing that a Count Vivian (d. 851, *Gallia Christiana*, xiv. 199a) ruled both the Abbey of S. Martin's and the Major Monasterium. One of these charters (*ibid.* ii. 658; cf. *Gall. Christ.*, xiv. 199b) proves that both congregations agreed upon the restoration of an oratory to S. Martin's. It was signed by Amalric, then Dean of S. Martin's. The secular and therefore distinct character of S. Martin's is indicated by the reference to it as a ' basilica.' But the exact significance of ' basilica ' is not clear. Vaucelle (p. 39 ff.) distinguishes it from ' monasterium ' or abbey, and ' ecclesia,' a term applied to cathedrals and parish churches (following Mabillon and Ducange). A ' basilica,' he says, was a collegiate church, partly monastic and partly secular in constitution. But Eusebius Bruno (Sudendorf, p. 222 f.) uses ' ecclesia ' of S. Martin. Vaucelle's conclusion is questioned by Levillain (*Moyen Âge*, May-June 1909, p. 197 ff.). Boissonnot, p. 5, seems to be on safer ground with the suggestion that a ' basilica ' was originally a burial chapel attached to a cathedral for the reception of the ' saints,' and that it became a centre of pilgrimage. This would suit the original condition of the chapel of S. Martin's built by S. Brice over the tomb of Martin. But Boissonnot distinguishes a ' basilica ' constructed by S. Lidore for the cathedral church of S. Maurice from that built by S. Brice. In the *Martyrol. Usuardi . . . Eccles. Turon.* (Bourassé) and his permission was therefore necessary for a long leave of absence from the monastery.[1]

The King's position was difficult. When Leo IX was in France in the autumn of 1049, Henry had contested his right to exercise jurisdiction upon French soil, and he had succeeded in preventing many of the bishops and abbots of France from attending the Synod of Reims, on the ground that he wanted the presence of the bishops in the army which was about to begin a campaign.[2] Now came the application from a distinguished scholar, who was also a Church dignitary, for permission to answer a summons which in a similar way offended French national prestige, and was contrary to an ancient custom whereby an ecclesiastic must be tried in his own province. Henry therefore determined to retain Berengar for judgment before a French synod.[3] Moreover, he was at war with Count Geoffrey of Anjou, the protector of Berengar.[4] Throughout his reign the King had been occupied with the endeavour to continue the policy of Robert the Pious (996–1031) which had for its object the repression of the great magnates

---

S. Martin's is called ' basilica ' on pp. 37, 42, 65, ' ecclesia beata Martini ' (p. 30), and ' Sancti martini ' (pp. 37, 41).

Mabillon sketches (p. 451) the process by which the King of France became Abbot of S. Martin's. When the right of appointment lapsed to the Crown, through the inability of the canons to select one of their own number, the Emperor appears on occasions to have appointed a local magnate, viz. Count Vivian (p. 658). On the break-up of the Carolingian empire, the right fell to Robert the Strong, Duke of the French, and to Odo his son, King of the West Franks (888–899). Under the Capetians the right became hereditary, and so the dignity of Abbot of S. Martin's was finally annexed to the royal house of France.

[1] Brucker, ii. 154, asks why Berengar could not go without the royal permission, if it was possible for another representative of S. Martin's at Tours to do so (*cf. infra*, p. 81). The question would be pertinent if we knew that the S. Martin's representative had *not* asked permission. On the contrary he may well have done so.

[2] Gfrörer, *Allgem. Kirchergesh.*, iv. pt. i. 515 ; Schwabe, p. 56 ; Halphen, p. 73 n. 5. These writers base their accounts on *Anselmi Hist. dedic. Eccles. S. Rem.* (Migne, 142, 1422 f.). Henry I was about to attack Count Geoffrey in Touraine.

[3] *Cf.* Delarc, *Rev. des Questions hist.*, xx. 145 f. Bröcking, p. 38, suggests that Henry's policy during this period was influenced by a desire to appease the Papacy, and that he followed the example of William of Normandy. Then why refuse Berengar permission to obey the papal order ? Schnitzer, p. 34, makes a similar conjecture. Brucker, ii. 157, contends that Henry was only following the Carolingian tradition which made the King the guardian of the interests of the French Church.

[4] Schwabe, pp. 53–56, describes the course of the hostilities. *Cf.* Halphen, pp. 71–75.

and the increase of the royal power, especially in view of the encroachment of the Emperor Henry III.[1] The petition of Berengar afforded an opportunity for affronting Geoffrey, so Henry not only forbade Berengar to go to Rome, but placed him in confinement,[2] and demanded from him a larger sum of money than Berengar 'had ever seen,' at the same time seizing his goods towards the payment of the fine.[3] This action was a direct blow at Count Geoffrey,[4] and it may have been a counterblast to Geoffrey's imprisonment of Gervase, Bishop of Le Mans.

Berengar complains that the King had forgotten his royal dignity and his duty as an abbot, but the confinement does not appear to have been severe nor to have been prolonged. Berengar emphasises rather the King's 'base action' in submitting him to the custody of a young royal favourite who was authorised to exact the fine.[5] Considerable liberty was allowed

---

[1] Giesebrecht, ii. 385 f. Henry III was trying to exert an influence in France through the instrumentality of Cluny. He had married a step-daughter of Geoffrey of Anjou in 1042. *Cf.* Steindorff, i. 154.

[2] Brucker (ii. 158) thinks Henry seized the opportunity of opposing the Papacy on account of his attitude at the Synod of Reims.

[3] Brucker (*ibid.*) turns this payment into a bribe paid by Berengar for his release.

[4] Ébersolt, p. 32; Schnitzer, p. 35, following Schwabe, p. 66. But it is doubtful whether it was a repulse of an overture for peace made by Geoffrey, as Schwabe says. He bases his conjecture on the supposition that Berengar was Geoffrey's ambassador in Normandy and France during 1050. Of this we have no proof. Moreover, on Schwabe's own theory of the course of events, the letter of Eusebius Bruno to Guy of Reims, one of the earliest gestures of peace, was not despatched until the end of 1050 or beginning of 1051 (p. 57). But Berengar was imprisoned in the late summer of 1050. Schwabe's view of Henry is that the 'weak Frenchman' was afraid to make a coalition with Geoffrey against the mighty confederacy of Empire and Papacy (p. 66).

[5] *D.S.C.*, p. 42: 'nichil a regia dignitate . . . cudiam dedit'; *ibid.* p. 47: 'totius regiae dignitatis oblitus, carcerandum dedisset cuidam adolescentulo suo, qua ex causa, etsi turpius dicere, turpe tamen erat scribere, ad exigendam a me quantam ego nunquam pecuniam noveram'; 'Epis. of Berengar to Richard' (Sudendorf, p. 211): 'dampnum quod mihi . . . intulit.' There is no need to see in the words 'turpius' and 'turpe' a base connection between the young man and the King. (*Cf.* Gfrörer, *Kirchengesch.*, iv. pt. i. 548; *cf.* Neander, vi. 315 n. 4.) The words refer rather to a base exaction. C. Will, *Die Restauration*, i. 74, alleges that the imprisonment of Berengar did not take place, and that Berengar's statement is untrue. Brucker, ii. 156, thinks that Berengar's version of his incarceration is exaggerated.

Widely different motives for the imprisonment have been suggested. Brucker, ii. 158, holds that it was a police measure taken against a disturber of the public peace. Sudendorf, p. 107 f., regards it as an act of tyranny to the Archdeacon. He had access to books, and while in confinement was able to make that closer study of the Scriptures and the doctrine of the Eucharist recommended to him by Ansfroi. He was free to correspond with his friends, and frankly reviewed recent events in letters written to Ansfroi and Ascelin. The details of the conference at Chartres have been reconstructed from his correspondence. He writes to Ansfroi that he had studied the Gospel of S. John, especially the passages in the sixth chapter relating to the Eucharist, with the greatest care. He had found such complete justification for his beliefs that it surpassed amazement that the eyes of reason should refuse so great a light, or should be blind in the presence of such light. He feared lest the warning of the Gospel might apply to Ansfroi: 'Woe, woe to you who have the key of knowledge, and while not entering in yourselves, refuse to allow others to enter.' While he had the greatest respect for Ansfroi's authority, yet he recalled the saying of the Lord, 'Whosoever is ashamed of me before men, of him will the Son of Man be ashamed before the angels in heaven,' and swore that through the love of the Lord Jesus he did not write this to insult Ansfroi. 'If nothing else could be proved from the Scriptures—indeed it stands indisputable—if, without any doubt, the best and most approved scholars and commentators on the canonical Scriptures, by whose authority the world is fortified and the Church prevails, perceive this, and if they have handed down their teaching not ambiguously, but more clearly expressed than light, and treated with great care, not

---

and greed on Henry's part. Städlin, ii. 34, and Neander, vi. 315, see in it punishment for heresy. Gfrörer (*Kirchengesch.*, iv. pt. i. 548; *Greg. VII*, i. 600 f.) holds that Henry had entrusted Berengar with a large sum of money to secure support for the royal programme of constituting a national church of France, but that he now abandoned this policy and demanded repayment of the money. But Gfrörer admitted that he would surrender his theory if a better one were produced. He contends (*Kirchengesch.*, iv. pt. i. 585, 589; *Greg. VII*, i. 601) that Henry abandoned Berengar when he realised that Leo IX was not the mere tool of the Emperor. Yet in his *Greg. VII*, vi. 641 (cf. *Kirchengesch.*, iv. pt. i. 547), he says that the imprisonment was invented by Henry and connived at by Berengar in order to protect the latter. *La Vérité hist.*, iv. 76, corrects Neander's view (vi. 315 n. 4) that Henry wanted to bestow the money on an unworthy favourite. Schwabe, p. 64 f., Loofs, p. 570, Ébersolt, p. 32, all assign the political motive of checking Count Geoffrey. It is difficult to see why Bröcking, p. 58, says that Schwabe on p. 64 n. 5 doubts the imprisonment of Berengar.

in a few, but in many parts of their writings, why doth your Christianity refuse this teaching, and place a stumbling-block before the blind, why are you ashamed of the Gospels and Epistles and the sayings of the most approved authorities in sacred writings, Ambrose, Augustine and Jerome ? ' [1]

In his letter to Ascelin he begs his friend to contradict the report that he had charged John the Scot with heresy ' in a manner inconsiderate, impious and unworthy of your priesthood.' But if he agreed with Paschasius, who alone maintained that in the Sacrament of the Lord's body the substance of bread is altogether wanting, he acted contrary to reason and the teaching of the Gospels and Epistles, especially against the apostle who had warned us against believing anything save what God had revealed. The view of the Sacrament was so clear that even a boy at school could understand and demonstrate it, provided he did not negligently grasp the force of the construction. That which Berengar had hoped to prove before the bishops, he desired, if an opportunity should be given, to discuss with Ascelin and others ; but so long as he was not able to do this, he begged in the name of the Lord, lest Ascelin bear the false testimony that Berengar had condemned John the Scot, although he admits that he had not read through John the Scot's book, ' I warn you to beware of the evangelical warning against him who has the keys of knowledge, and while not entering in himself, forbids others to enter. Remember the words of the prophet, " The people provoke to anger, and they are lying witnesses who say to those who see, You do not want to see ; and to those who pay attention, You do not want to pay attention, with us, to things that are right." ' He entirely agrees with the statement of Arnulf that no one should transgress the limits of the evangelists, the apostles, and Ambrose, Augustine, and Jerome. He concludes by expressing the hope that he may soon meet Ascelin.[2]

---

[1] Sudendorf, p. 208 ff. Written before September 1050 (*ibid.* p. 103). Berengar refers to himself as ' carcere clausus ' (*ibid.* p. 209). A discussion of the events of this summer occurs in Sudendorf, pp. 103–115. Schwabe, p. 65, says it is not proved that this letter was written during confinement.

[2] Migne, 150, 66 ; Sudendorf, p. 10 ff. It was written during his imprisonment (*ibid.* p. 14). Schwabe, p. 65, denies this, and holds that the letter was written after his release, a fact which is proved by the words

In his reply Ascelin corrects one of Berengar's statements concerning the conference at Chartres, and says that he had misunderstood the remarks of Provost William. He expresses surprise that a man of such prudence as Berengar should praise the book of John the Scot after confessing that he had not read it through, for if he had read it he would not have praised it. Ascelin objects to the suggestion that he had 'inconsiderately, impiously and in a manner unworthy of his priesthood' condemned the Scot's teaching; on the other hand he would retain to the end inviolable the sacred conviction of his heart that the bread and wine of the altar, by the power of the Holy Spirit and through the ministry of the priest, are made [1] the true body and true blood of Christ. He then refers to the discussion which took place at Chartres on Gregory's prayer, and continues: 'Your prudence knows whether the words of heretics or the cup of poison should be avoided, because the latter at first soothes sweetly and then silently kills.' For the rest, with Paschasius and other Catholics,[2] he holds, nay venerates and embraces, the true body and true blood of Christ which are to be received by the faithful on the altar beneath the form of bread and wine. Nor is this contrary to reason. He warns Berengar that his own warning concerning those who retain the keys of knowledge, and neither enter themselves nor permit others to do so, may come back on his own head. He urges him to give up his perverse ideas, not to be cruel to his friends in an unheard-of and vain manner, not to commit himself so freely, nor to refuse to submit himself to the wings of the evangelical hen,[3] lest he caused the splendour of mind which God had given him to become silly, so that he found himself cast out

---

'si mihi tutum fieret,' but surely these words and others prove the opposite as Sudendorf contends. Heurtevent, p. 150 n. 1, says that the letter of Berengar and Ascelin's reply presuppose the session of the Council of Vercelli, or its termination. At any rate, the phraseology (especially the reference to the 'key of knowledge') of the letters to Ansfroi and Ascelin suggests that they were written at the same time. It is a trick of some writers to repeat themselves in this way in documents written at the same time.

[1] 'effici.'

[2] Sudendorf, p. 112, thinks that Ascelin's views were not quite orthodox, a point noticed and disputed by *La Vérité hist.*, iii. 310.

[3] An allusion to S. Matt. xxiii. 37; S. Luke xiii. 34.

and spurned by all. He ought to be ashamed to patronise a book which had been condemned at Vercelli in full synod, and on account of which he had been marked with the blot of heresy. 'Return, therefore, I pray you, to the catholic and apostolic tradition, so that the apostolic saying may be fulfilled in you which you turned towards me.' The letter breaks off suddenly with the quotation: 'And if you discern otherwise, and God shall reveal this to you.' [1]

During this time Berengar fulfilled his promise to write to the clergy of Chartres. But instead of answering their questions he said that he would make his views known at the impending Council of Vercelli, and although Durand has probably over-emphasised the tone of the letter, which he said he had seen, Berengar seems to have made an attack on the Roman Church, and especially upon Pope Leo, whom he called a heretic.[2]

Whether Berengar was still in confinement when Ascelin's reply arrived, and when he wrote to the clergy of Chartres, is not clear. It is probable that Henry kept him under surveillance until the news arrived that the Council of Vercelli had ended. Ascelin's letter shows that his friends did not ostracise him after the event was known, and indeed he had need of their support, for new troubles were brewing in France. But first we must see what had happened at Vercelli.

---

[1] Migne, 150, 67 f. Sudendorf, p. 17, dates this letter in 1050, shortly after the Council of Vercelli.

[2] Durand (Migne, 149, 1422b–c).

CHAPTER V

THE COUNCIL OF VERCELLI

At Préaux, at Brionne, and at Paris Berengar's efforts to secure support against his enemies had ended in complete failure. During this early period of the controversy Berengar does not appear to have thought out his own theological position with sufficient clearness to convince even his friends of the effectiveness of his case. So much he admits himself,[1] and all through the dispute the lack of a driving personality prevented him from presenting an impressive appeal against the consistent antagonism of his enemies. It was one thing to convince the students of Tours, who were already under the influence of his beneficent supervision of the schools, it was quite another matter to make headway against strong-willed opponents like Lanfranc and Humbert, whose influence in all respects was thrown with the heartiest emphasis into the reforming policy of the Papacy. Yet when his powerful friends in Anjou had failed to succour him, and when the leading magnates of Normandy and France had deliberately checked him, he still had friends in Tours and in Italy who dared to say a word in his defence at the Council of Vercelli.

It has been suggested, with probability, that Lanfranc was retained in the Pope's entourage after the Council of Rome on account of his familiarity with the Normans.[2] At Vercelli the number of distinguished clergy who assembled for the Council on September 1, 1050,[3] was not small, but they belonged mostly to Italy.[1] Two important causes relating to ecclesiastical affairs in France were waiting to be settled. Geoffrey of Anjou had been summoned to answer for his imprisonment of Gervase, Bishop of Le Mans.[2] The Count did not appear, but no further action was taken against him by the Pope. There is no record that his case was discussed. Possibly the representations of Eusebius Bruno, Bishop of Angers, successfully stayed any further proceedings against Geoffrey.

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 44.

[2] Heurtevent, p. 131 n. 5.

[3] The date of the Council is fixed by the *Chronicle* of Herman Contractus (Migne, 143, 254a), who did not live beyond 1052–54. On the proceedings of the Council *cf.* Héfélé–Leclercq, iv. pt. ii. 1056 ff.

The affair of the absent Berengar received very different treatment. No writing of his was produced which might supply the Council with evidence against him, but a book attributed to John the Scot was quoted. Even so, no thorough examination of John the Scot's teaching took place. A single sentence, stating that the Sacrament of the Altar is a similitude, figure, and pledge of the body and blood of Christ, was read.[3] Peter, a deacon of the Roman Church,[4] excited the assembly by exclaiming 'If hitherto we hold only the figure, when shall we have the thing itself?'[5] Leo called upon one of the clergy to state in what way Berengar was involved by John the Scot's teaching, and the only reply was that Berengar was a heretic.[6] Then it was that the clerk from S. Martin's at Tours, a learned young man of honourable character, a disciple of Gézon, Bishop of Liège, who had been sent by the clergy of Tours to secure Leo's intervention with Henry I, to procure Berengar's release, excitedly shouted 'By Almighty God you lie!'[1] By Leo's orders he was immediately arrested, to save him from violent treatment by the assembly. At the suggestion of Lanfranc, John the Scot's book was torn in pieces. Thereupon a young Lombard named Stephen[2] exclaimed that they would be compelled also to destroy a certain work of Augustine if they took the trouble to examine it. Clearly he had absorbed Berengar's teaching. He also was apprehended by Leo's order, to save him from assault.[3] Doctrine alleged to be that of Berengar was then quoted and condemned, and Leo pronounced him a heretic[4] and deprived him of Communion.[5] The orthodox teaching was declared and confirmed.[6]

---

[1] Lanfranc (Migne, 150, 413c, followed by Milo, *ibid.* 36b) stated that they came from all parts of the world. This Berengar directly denied—'cum de ejusdem regionis et linguae ad Vercellicum tumultum illum convenerint' (*D.S.C.*, p. 44). Sudendorf, p. 109, wrongly interpreted this to mean the French bishops. He is corrected by Schwabe, p. 69 n. 5; 'ejusdem regionis' refers to Italy. *Cf.* Schnitzer, p. 42 n. 3; Heurtevent, p. 45. Ulf, Bishop of Dorchester, was present, and barely escaped deposition (*Sax. Chron.* E. 1047).

[2] 'Epis. of Eusebius to Guy of Reims' (Sudendorf, p. 203; *cf.* p. 93). Bröcking, p. 100 ff., conjectured that the choice of appearing at Rome or Vercelli was not left to Geoffrey. But in his *Ergänzungsheft*, p. 14 (following Loofs, p. 569), he withdrew this comment.

[3] *D.S.C.*, p. 43. *Cf.* Heurtevent, p. 145 n. 2. Heurtevent holds that the book quoted at Vercelli was the work of Ratramn, and that the passage selected had been criticised at Chartres by Ascelin. He says that a torn MS. of the same exists at Avranches.

[4] Sudendorf, p. 109, wrongly identifies him with Peter Damiani. Peter the deacon was the spokesman of Leo IX at the Synod of Reims in 1049 (Brucker, ii. 10 ff.). He died shortly after at Langres, during Leo's second journey to France in the autumn of 1050 (*La Vérité hist.*, iv. 82).

[5] *D.S.C.*, p. 43.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 47.

Berengar not unnaturally complains of the Pope's unapostolic action. 'I out of reverence for the Roman pontiff undertook the Roman journey with much labour.' Henry I prevented him. 'This Leo heard at Vercelli, yet he was moved neither by apostolic dignity nor by paternal pity nor humane compassion,' and instead of rebuking the King 'pronounced me a heretic with a sacrilegious utterance.'[7] John the Scot's book should have been thoroughly and carefully examined, for the Lord says 'Search the Scriptures.'[8] He contends that his own views could not have been known at Vercelli because he had not yet completely formulated them.[9] The two clerks who intervened on his behalf were not his disciples and were scarcely authorised to defend him.[10] In order to throw discredit upon the proceedings, Berengar reports that the Pope stayed at the house of Gregory the Bishop of Vercelli, who had outraged the fiancée of a prominent Pavian citizen, who was the Bishop's uncle.[1] He also alleges that when Leo was charged at Vercelli with reordaining simonist bishops and priests, the Pope asked the Council to pray to God to forgive him his error, but so fickle was he that he allowed himself later to be rebuked at Rome for yielding to pressure at Vercelli, and following his Roman advisers, especially Cardinal Humbert, the Bishop of Silva Candida, he reordained Mainus or Magnus, the Bishop of Rennes; Itier, Bishop of Limoges, and Perenesius, Abbot of S. Saviour at Redon[2] in the diocese of Vannes.[1] One result of the condemnation of Berengar at Vercelli was to increase the political antagonism of Geoffrey of Anjou towards the Papacy, and to strengthen his relationship with Berengar. Geoffrey retaliated by making reprisals against his prisoner, Bishop Gervase of Le Mans.[2] Meanwhile Berengar, who had regained his liberty, took refuge at Angers and became the guest of Eusebius Bruno, the bishop, who thereby fell more completely under suspicion of sharing his guest's heretical views,[3] especially as he was not inactive in the defence of Berengar. He had already written to Guy, Bishop of Reims, complaining of the Pope's unfair treatment of the Archdeacon of Angers, against whom 'not the least error or fault could be alleged,' and he promised to write at greater length on this matter.[4] In the following year (1051) he wrote to Gervase of Le Mans and complained of the Pope's order for the destruction of John the Scot's book. He also criticised the Pope for reordaining the bishops.[5] This action called forth the rebuke of Cardinal Humbert, who warned him that his support of the eucharistic heresy had been reported to the Curia. Humbert urges that for a thousand years or more one doctrine had been taught on the theory of the Eucharist. Now the ancient faith was being disturbed by sophists and Aristoteleans, and letters from France stated that Eusebius was associated with Berengar. The Cardinal's communication was a reply to a letter sent to Rome by Eusebius, in which the latter had asked for directions concerning divorce. Humbert says that a man who takes another wife while his own is living is as guilty as

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 46.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 47. 'Alter compatriota tuus' (referring to Lanfranc). Heurtevent, p. 145, says that he was a canon of Pavia.

[3] *D.S.C.*, p. 47. [4] *Ibid.* p. 42. [5] *Ibid.* p. 38.

[6] Lanfranc (Migne, 150, 413c). *Cf.* Bernold of Constance (Migne, 148, 1454b); an account derived from Lanfranc. Brucker, ii. 162 f., suggests that the dispute would have died out after Vercelli, but for the fact that it was a learned controversy, and so engaged the attention of the schools, and because Geoffrey continued to support Berengar.

[7] *D.S.C.*, p. 42. [8] *Ibid.* p. 43. [9] *Ibid.* p. 44.

[10] *Ibid.* p. 46. Gfrörer, *Greg. VII*, vi. 641 f., says that these two clergy were sent by Henry I to represent the royalist French church.

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 40. Gfrörer, *Kirchengesch.*, iv. pt. i. 544, rightly points out that at Vercelli Leo probably did not know the facts of the case. The matter was kept from him by a subordinate, who was bribed by the Bishop (*cf.* Höfler, ii. 116; Héfélé–Leclercq, iv. pt. ii. 1059). At the Roman Synod of 1051 the Bishop was displaced and excommunicated (Watterich, i. 107; Höfler, ii. 127; Héfélé–Leclercq, iv. pt. ii. 1059). Schnitzer, p. 42, states that Berengar tried to discredit the œcumenical character of the Council by alleging that most of the bishops were Italians. But this was surely only to contradict Lanfranc's statement that they came from all parts of Europe.

[2] *D.S.C.*, p. 40 f. Berengar's statement is confirmed by a fragment of a letter sent by Eusebius, Bishop of Angers, to Gervase, Bishop of Le Mans, which is quoted by Humbert in a letter written to Eusebius in 1051 (printed for the first time by K. Francke, *Neues Archiv*, vii (1881) 614, and by Brucker, ii. 374). Eusebius states: 'quam episcopos reordinaverit.' This Humbert denied, and Halfmann, *Cardinal Humbert* (1883), p. 59, says that Berengar's statement cannot be accepted without confirmation. He does not appear to be aware of Francke's evidence. But he admits that Berengar did not get his idea from the air, and goes on to point out that Humbert regarded simonist bishops as heretics, whose ordination the Church did not recognise. We may infer that Halfmann means that the second consecration would then be regarded as consecration for the first time, for he admits that cases of reordination were known (*cf.* Peter Damiani, *Liber Gratissimus*, in Dümmler, *Libelli de Lite*, i. 18). He concludes that the question cannot be decided. Héfélé–Leclercq, iv. pt. ii. 1059 f. (followed by Schnitzer, p. 45), treats Berengar's report as doubtful. The matter has been settled by L. Saltet, *Les Réordinations* (1907), pp. 186–189. The Bishop of Rennes and Abbot of Redon were the only Breton bishops present at the Council of Rome in 1050 when they were reordained. They signed the decree of the Council in that year (Migne, 143, 647b–c). Itier was reordained in 1053 (*cf.* Bröcking, pp. 81 n. 4, 82 n. 5; Mansi, xix. 805 f., gives 1052). Saltet remarks: 'Il n'y a aucune raison de suspecter le témoinage de Berengar sur les réordinations de Leo IX.' We may add that this important detail confirms the general trustworthiness of Berengar's account of the controversy. It is to be preferred to that of Lanfranc. If the latter was an eye-witness at Vercelli, Berengar obtained his information from a clerk who was present (*D.S.C.*, p. 47: 'sicut mihi ipse narravit'), and from these three dignitaries (*ibid.* p. 41: 'quia noti mihi sunt, et mecum de eo, quod Romae gestum fuit, ipsi egerant'). Heurtevent, p. 146: 'Mais la netteté, la précision et l'abondance des détails fournis par l'accusé lui-même ne laissent pas de doute sur l'exactitude des faits qu'il rapporte, et, au point de vue historique, son témoinage l'emporte sur celui de Lanfranc.' Lanfranc's account appears in Migne, 150, 413c. He is followed by Bernold

(Migne, 148, 1453 ff.). On Bernold cf. *La Vérité hist.*, iv. 81 f., which prefers Lanfranc's account.

[1] The names of the first and third appear in the list of bishops present at the Council (Migne 143, 647b–c). *Cf.* Bröcking, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* (1892), p. 178.

[2] Francke, *Neues Archiv*, vii. 614. Brucker, ii. 394 (translation, p. 144): 'non parum carceri tuo contulisset (*i.e.* Geoffrey) si nihil irrationabile, si nil frustrandum apostolicus attemptasset.' *Cf.* Bröcking, p. 76.

[3] Durand (Migne, 149, 1422d).

[4] Sudendorf, p. 204. Delarc, *Rev. des Questions hist.*, xx. 124.

[5] Francke, *Neues Archiv*, vii. 614: 'quando non minus inconsiderate si pace illius hoc dici liceat, quam episcopos reordinaverit, Johannis Scoti libellum concidisset.'

he who kills his wife. An appeal to Rome was not necessary on these points, because Eusebius had the New Testament by him for guidance.[1]

In his letter to Henry I, Theoduin of Liège charged Eusebius as well as Berengar with reviving old heresies, a charge repeated by Durand.[2] They taught that the eucharistic body was not a body, but a shadow and figure of the body of the Lord. They destroyed lawful marriage, and denied baptism to infants. Theoduin could not understand why Eusebius was allowed to remain a bishop. Yet because of his episcopal rank, the King might not, on his own authority, punish him.[3] When Theoduin's letter is coupled with that of Humbert, it appears that on some marriage questions, notably that of divorce, Eusebius was inclined to adopt an attitude not entirely consonant with that of the Church. Pope Alexander II later on referred to the same matter in a letter to Eusebius.[4] However, these reports indicate that the assistance given by the Bishop of Angers to Berengar was inspired by more than the desire to support the politics of Geoffrey Martel. He sympathised with the dogmatic teaching of Berengar.

About this time the inclination of Eusebius materialised in Berengar's favour through another turn in the wheel of Angevine politics, although there is no reason for assuming that the treatment offered to his case by the Papacy, and the growing hostility to him at the court of Henry I, did not create a genuine desire to assist him in Anjou. Geoffrey and Eusebius convened an ecclesiastical assembly at Tours, probably in the spring or autumn of 1051.[5] In spite of the interdict under which the Angevine territories lay, this was made possible by the attitude of Arnulf the Archbishop and the clergy of Tours, who refused to submit to the papal condemnation of Geoffrey.[1] The main object of the Count was to secure a favourable decision on his quarrel with the Pope, which might be used against the Curia.[2] Gervase, Bishop of Le Mans, was temporarily released from his confinement to attend the synod.[3] Whether or not he attempted to involve his oppressor in the dogmatic implications of the eucharistic controversy,[4] that matter was certainly discussed.[5] At Tours Berengar was surrounded by his friends, both Angevine and Touraingelle. Besides Geoffrey and Eusebius, he could rely upon the support of Albert, Abbot of Marmoutier,[6] and the Abbot of S. Aubin at Angers,[7] and if no definite acquittal from the charges brought against him is recorded, the question was allowed to remain at rest.[8] Geoffrey seems to have gained little from the proceedings. He never appealed to any finding of this synod in his favour.[9]

---

[1] Francke, *Neues Archiv*, vii. 614–619. He dates the letter 1051 (p. 617). Lessing, p. 157, doubts Eusebius' orthodoxy.

[2] Migne, 149, 1422d.

[3] *Ibid.* 1439b–c. *Cf. infra*, p. 88 ff. Gfrörer, *Allgem. Kirchengesch.*, iv. pt. i. 510, suggests that these charges were dropped after 1050 by the Church authorities because the programme against Berengar was too full.

[4] Bishop, i. 275. On p. 280 he says that this letter has no historical interest. But it does support the decision against the orthodoxy of Eusebius on the divorce question.

[5] Halphen, p. 124 (*cf.* p. 74), dates the synod in 1050 or 1051; Sudendorf, p. 123 (*cf.* p. 35), dates it at the beginning of 1050. Most modern writers overlook it, but it is discussed by Loofs, p. 571 f., Semisch, p. 159 n. 16. The former dates it summer 1050. Brucker, ii. 164, places it at

Meanwhile, events showed that Berengar's flight from Paris was fully justified, especially as the Chartrains had secured the ear of Henry I,[10] and were urging the King to take

---

the end of 1050 or beginning of 1051. He thinks that Lanfranc attended it with a papal commission (p. 165). Schwabe, p. 70, dates it ' somewhat after the time of the Council of Vercelli ' (Sept. 1050). This Synod of Tours is mentioned in the letter of Geoffrey to Leo IX (Sudendorf, p. 213 ff.) written 1051–52 (Schwabe, p. 75 ; *cf. infra*, p. 102 n. 1), and in the letter of Eusebius to Berengar (Migne, 147, 1102–1204 ; de Roye, pp. 48–51) written 1063–65. *Cf. infra*, p. 139.

[1] Sudendorf, p. 122 f. *Cf.* their attitude in the *Narratio Controv.* (Bouquet, xii. 459).

[2] Sudendorf, p. 122.

[3] On the relations between Geoffrey and Gervase, *cf.* Schwabe, chapter II.

[4] Sudendorf, p. 123. Gervase attempted to involve Geoffrey and some of the assembly in the charge of heresy.

[5] Brucker, ii. 165 n. 3. The word ' emersit ' in Eusebius' letter shows that the matter was raised suddenly and was not on the agenda.

[6] *D.S.C.*, p. 52.

[7] ' Epis. of Geoffrey to Hildebrand ' (Sudendorf, p. 218).

[8] ' Epis. of Eusebius to Berengar ' (Migne, 147, 1204b) : ' quaerimonia . . . sedata est.' Brucker, ii. 165 f., says that these words show that no discussion took place, but that Albert and the clerks of Chartres were content with showing that Catholic doctrine was based on Scripture, a compromise which Berengar refused.

[9] Sudendorf, p. 123.

[10] ' Epis. of Berengar to Richard ' (Sudendorf, p. 211) ; Durand (Migne, 149, 1422c).

definite steps for the suppression of Berengar and his teaching. The clerks of Chartres, like everyone else at that stage of the controversy, possessed no written statement of Berengar's views to which they might appeal, so they resorted to the curious but unfair device of quoting an inscription upon a silver cup which had once been the property of Fulbert, 'Woe to the prophets, who prophesy from their hearts, saying, "Thus saith the Lord," when the Lord hath not spoken!' They persuaded the King that these words were Fulbert's own, and that he had uttered them against Berengar, whereas they were a quotation from Augustine,[1] who took them from Ezekiel.[2] This is a sample of the curious theological mentality of the day, which did not scruple to wrench any verse of Scripture from its context in order to give point to an accusation or an argument. Berengar alleges that Ascelin had attempted to secure authority from Augustine in the same way, so also had a compatriot of Ascelin's in a discussion at Poitiers.[3] Henry I yielded to these persuasions and gave notice of a council to be summoned on French soil in order to deal with Berengar's case.[4] Whether or not this correspondence took place before the second visit of Leo IX to France in the late autumn of 1050 is not clear. If it preceded the Pope's visit, it suggests that the King was still jealous of papal interference in the ecclesiastical affairs of France, for there is no record of any communication between Henry and the Pope. Moreover, as Berengar was now a guest of Eusebius at Angers, and thus a refugee under the protection of Geoffrey of Anjou, it is possible that Henry's action was partly influenced by antagonism to Geoffrey,[5] with whom hostilities were still maintained.

The King's decision was not left unchallenged. A cleverly composed letter [1] reached him from Theoduin, the Bishop of Liège, a Bavarian by race who was related to the imperial house of Germany.[2] After referring to reports which had passed from France into Germany that Eusebius of Angers and Berengar of Tours had revived old heresies,[3] Theoduin commends Henry's zeal and fervour towards Holy Church, and the pious and kingly resolution which had caused him to summon a council where this error might be cast out of his kingdom. Would that it were possible to effect this, and that chastisement might reach those who were culpable. But by this means such an object could not be achieved, for Eusebius was a bishop, and no bishop could undergo condemnation save before a papal tribunal.[4] If these miserable lost men appeared before a royal council, as they themselves desired, being sure of impunity, very great scandal to the faithful would occur, because they could not be punished. Those who saw them go unpunished, and not degraded from their rank, would think either that the Council was too weak or that the defendants were cleared, so the last state would be worse than the first. 'Therefore we desire your Majesty to be persuaded that you will give orders that no one in the meantime listens to their sacrilegious and evil statement, until, having received the sanction of the Roman See, you are able to condemn them.' Quotations then follow from Leo the Great,[5] Cyril, Ambrose,

---

[1] 'Epis. to Richard' (Sudendorf, p. 212; *cf.* p. 113 f.). Gfrörer, *Allgem. Kirchengesch.*, iv. pt. i. 586, thinks that Berengar had communicated his views to the clerks of Chartres, who forwarded them to Henry, together with this report about Fulbert.

[2] Ezek. xiii. 2.

[3] Sudendorf, p. 212.

[4] *Cf.* 'Epis. to Theoduin of Liège' (Migne, 146, 1439 f.).

[5] *Cf.* Schwabe, p. 66, who sees in the Council of Paris an attempt on the part of Henry to unite the papal and court parties among the French clergy against Geoffrey. Gfrörer (*Kirchengesch.*, iv. pt. i. 547; *Greg. VII*, vi. 630) sees in Henry's action an attempt to support Berengar and to break openly with the Papacy.

---

[1] *Cf. supra*, p. 85; Migne, 146, 1439–1442. Guitmund mentions the letter (Hurter, xxxviii. 8). Following Mabillon (*Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 21; *Vetera Analecta*, p. 446 f.) this letter is dated 1050 by the older writers, on the ground that by urging that the matter should be referred to papal jurisdiction, Theoduin shows that the Councils of Rome and Vercelli had not yet taken place. But Theoduin is concerned mainly with Eusebius, whose convictions were not discussed at those Councils. Schwabe, p. 67 n. 1, thinks that although the letter was written before the Council of Paris (Oct. 1051), the year (1050 or 1051) cannot be decided. Sudendorf, p. 22, followed by most modern writers, gives 1051. Héfélé–Leclercq, iv. pt. ii. 1063, doubts whether the letter referred to the Council of Paris. Brucker, ii, 174, doubts its authenticity.

[2] Ægidius Aureæ Vallis (Chapeauville, *De Pontificum Leodiensium*, 1613, ii. 3: 'de nobiliori regum familia trahens originem . . . de Bavaria oriundus'). (Ægidius = Giles of Liège, who died in 1251; *cf.* Chevalier, *Répertoire*, 1788.) Cf. *Hist. Litt.*, viii. 23; *Anselmi Gesta* (*Mon. Ger. SS.*, vii. 195): 'Thietwinus episcopus . . . ex illis partibus' (*i.e.* Bavaria); Alberic of the Three Fountains (Bouq., xi. 353c: 'consanguineus Imperatoris.' *Cf.* Migne, 146, 1437a). Steindorff, ii. 52, wrongly attributes this statement to Ægidius or Anselm.

[3] *Cf. supra*, p. 85.

[4] Migne, 146, 1439c.

[5] *Ibid.* 1440c.

Augustine, Basil, Eusebius,[1] and Hilary, showing that Eusebius Bruno and Berengar were already anathema. Further action against them should be postponed until the French and German bishops, 'Your friend the Emperor,' and the Pope had deliberated upon the matter.[2]

In this last sentence Theoduin reveals his motive in writing. It was a clever attempt to win over Henry I to the imperial and ecclesiastical policy of Emperor and Pope.[3] The prior place is given to the Emperor because Theoduin knew that Henry had resented Leo IX's action at Reims. Eusebius Bruno, the political and ecclesiastical agent of Geoffrey of Anjou, Henry's enemy, is kept in the foreground all through the letter. No reference is made to Berengar's condemnation at Rome and Vercelli, partly because Henry and some of the French bishops objected to this action as being contrary to the ancient privileges of the French Church, partly because Theoduin, a zealous upholder of canonical action,[4] probably regarded the condemnation of Berengar, in the absence of the latter, as irregular. It is even possible that Theoduin's letter was inspired from Rome, and that a door was being opened which would allow a rapprochement between Henry I and the Papacy. The Pope had held no Council on French soil during his second journey at the end of 1050. If Henry would now ask his permission to hold a Council for the examination of Eusebius and Berengar, it would be granted, and the royal dignity, ruffled by the Synod of Reims, would be placated. At the same time, by applying to the Curia, Henry would give public, if tacit recognition of Leo's claim to supervise ecclesiastical affairs in his kingdom. If Eusebius of Angers were reprimanded in a French council, Geoffrey of Anjou would become further isolated. Thus the case of Berengar was being used as a pawn in the ecclesiastico-political policy of the Papacy.

[1] Eusebius, Basil, and Cyril are names not often quoted by writers in this era.

[2] Migne, 146, 1442b–c.

[3] *Cf.* Gfrörer, *Kirchengesch.*, iv. pt. i. 547; *Greg. VII*, vi. 630. Theoduin's letter, although couched in friendly terms, really conveyed a threat of war from the Emperor. Henry gave way and no Council was held in 1050. When Henry realised that Leo IX was not a mere tool of the Emperor he abandoned Berengar (*Kirchengesch.*, iv. pt. i. 585 f.).

[4] *Cf.* his attitude on the condemnation of a bishop, and his many references to patristic texts.

On the other hand, if Henry declined the proposal, offence to Geoffrey of Anjou had been forestalled by the ostensible proviso that Eusebius his agent should not be judged at a French council without the papal consent, and, on the contrary, if Henry proceeded with his plan and condemned Eusebius and Berengar, Geoffrey would know that this had been done against the wish of both Emperor and Pope. None the less was this clever despatch an attempt to counter Angevine policy and to keep France divided. Geoffrey, through the Bishop of Angers, was casting around for a combination against the Papacy, as the letter of Eusebius to Guy, Archbishop of Reims, shows. Theoduin knew that both Eusebius and Berengar desired an examination of their case before a French council. Berengar informed his friend Richard that, if the King wished, he would satisfy him that the condemnation of John the Scot and the approval of Paschasius at Vercelli were unjust.[1] So Theoduin advised the King not to play into their hands. But if Theoduin was an instrument of the Papacy, the scheme miscarried, and Henry proceeded with his arrangements for the Council, although the fact that it did not meet until October 1051 may reflect a delay brought about by the receipt of Theoduin's letter.

Meanwhile Berengar, who a year before had set out with high hope of securing in Normandy and France powerful protectors to supplement the support he was receiving in Anjou, now saw himself compelled to act on the defensive, and to conserve wherever possible the support of private friends, especially as some of them were writing to him in terms of mild rebuke. The fine imposed by Henry remained a source of vexation to him. Years afterwards he spoke bitterly of it in the *De Sacra Cœna*.[2] About this time (1051) he applied to a friend named Richard,[3] asking him to intercede with Henry for compensation :

> Since I know it is easy for you to speak to the King, I wish you would say a word on my behalf, in case he might out of consideration

---

[1] 'Epis. to Richard' (Sudendorf, p. 211 ; Giles, i. 18).

[2] *D.S.C.*, p. 47.

[3] Sudendorf, p. 211 f. ; *cf.* 19, 117 f. Heurtevent, p. 151 n. 2. Mabillon (*Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 21 ; *Annales*, iv. 515) associates Richard with Abbot R. . . . mentioned in Frollant's letter to Berengar (*cf. infra*, p. 117). Heurtevent thinks that this 'R.' was Reginald, Abbot of

> for humanity, liberality, his royal dignity and Christianity compensate me by some act of royal munificence for the loss which he most unjustly and most unworthily of his royal dignity inflicted on me—a clerk of his Church. It he does so he will exculpate himself in no small degree from a considerable fault at a small expense. If he does not do it, he still has me ready at hand to serve the royal majesty in this alone, namely to satisfy him and any others he likes, by an appeal to written authorities, that John the Scot was unjustly condemned and Paschasius was unjustly approved at the Council of Vercelli.

Berengar refers in similar terms to the action of the clergy of Chartres, who had tried to prejudice the King's mind by dragging in the authority of Fulbert of Chartres,[1] and he continues :

> What John the Scot wrote he wrote at the advice and request of his (Henry's) predecessor Charles the Great,[2] who, being as devoted to religion as he was strenuous in affairs, lest the folly of the unlettered and materially-minded men of the time should prevail, laid upon that learned man, John the Scot, the task of collecting from the written authorities that which would overthrow their folly.[3] Hence it is necessary that he shall give his support to the dead against the calumnies of the living, unless he prefers to show himself unworthy of the succession and throne of his illustrious predecessor, who, careful concerning the duty of understanding the Scriptures, demanded such obedience from that learned man when the latter was alive, so as not to darken the light of truth.[4]

Berengar complains of the behaviour of Ascelin, who at a gathering of clergy held at Poitiers had quoted Augustine against him. This is the only reference to the Synod of Poitiers which has come down to us.[5]

Another letter was written in precisely similar terms asking

S. Peter at Bourgueil. Neander, vi. 316 n. 2, holds that Richard was an influential clerk at Henry's court. Gfrörer, *Kirchengesch.*, iv. pt. i. 586, describes him as an influential noble at the court, and dates the letter 1053 (misled by Durand on the date of the Council of Paris). *L'Anjou hist.*, ii. 6, suggests that the letter was written from Angers.

[1] *Cf. supra*, p. 87.

[2] He means Charles the Bald.

[3] 'ineptia,' a word often used in the *De Sacra Cœna*.

[4] Sudendorf, p. 212, has omitted the concluding words 'Sacramentum quidem . . . sacramentum communionis' printed by d'Achery, *Spicilegium*, iii. 400. They are a later addition.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 212, *cf.* pp. 19, 114 ; Schnitzer, p. 63 n. 1.

William, the Treasurer of S. Martin's, to intercede with the King, to secure compensation for the fine.[1]

His friends were urging him to moderation if not compliance with the papal wishes. Drogo of Paris paid him another visit, and when the latter returned home he appears to have spoken of Berengar as a heretic, if the statement of the Archdeacon reported from a letter which has been lost may be trusted. Drogo emphatically denied the charge :

> Believe nothing rashly. Would, my Lord, that either I had never had your favour or had not so easily lost it ! I am told that you are angry with me for saying what I have never said. May the Almighty preserve my mind from all heretical corruption : after I left you I did not say you were a heretic, nor have I thought you were. I say again, if after I left you I said you were a heretic, may I be one myself. This has arisen I know from some—whom, I know not—with whom I have discussed your opinions. Despising their brutish slowness, and not tolerating the noise of the boisterous, buoyed up as it were by the reward of peace and quiet, I was dumb, and being unwilling to give what was holy to the dogs, or pearls to the swine, I hung up my harp upon the willows, and unwilling to sing the Lord's song in a foreign land. Since sinners stood confronting me, I was dumb and silent from the good, and from this silence they were able foolishly to think that I had joined their herd. But now what shall I say of you who have believed such a thing so easily, you who have conceived such opprobrium against your nearest friend ? I praise you, in this I praise you not. Would that what is said to me of you were false, although that which you have been persuaded of concerning me is nothing. Indeed, they say that your ears are especially open, and your mind is very credulous to the voice of sycophants.[2] This being so, my case is in danger. I could have written about Ivo of Chartres—and the weight to be attached to his accusation—and of certain others. But what will satisfy if what I have already written does not ? [3]

---

[1] Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 22 (Sudendorf, p. 19 f.). The phraseology of this fragment is similar to that in the first paragraph of the letter to Richard. The *Hist. Litt.*, viii. 220, suggests that it may have been copied from it. But this resemblance suggests rather that Berengar wrote to Richard and William at the same time and, as sometimes occurs in correspondence, simply repeated his phraseology. The *Hist. Litt.* says that the addressee may have been ' William ' or ' Walter.'

[2] ' adulatorum.'

[3] Sudendorf, p. 210 f., *cf.* p. 115 f. He dates the letter *c.* 1051. The reference to Chartres suggests that it was written after Berengar went there.

Drogo was certainly a writer of beautiful letters, and this one contains some significant points. The hostility to Berengar at Chartres had now passed beyond the ranks of the illiterate clergy whom the nameless good-for-nothing had led against him in that city. If Ivo the Grammaticus and later Scolasticus of Chartres [1] was now among his critics, Berengar had cause enough to be susceptible to the slightest and least grounded report of the disloyalty of his friends, and his complaint against Drogo appears to have been justified. In later years a rumour of Drogo's hostility to the Archdeacon reached Liège and perhaps Mainz.[2] It is probable that at this time Drogo's disloyalty had not assumed serious proportions, and that his repudiation of the charge was therefore partly justified, yet Berengar's instinct proved to be correct.

In the interval between the Councils of Vercelli and Paris Berengar began to write in opprobrious terms of Leo IX,[3] and of the principal agents of the Curia who had succeeded in securing his condemnation at Rome and Vercelli. This polemic reached its climax in the *De Sacra Cœna*, a philippic of Demosthenaic bitterness. The first trace of this attitude is re-echoed in a letter written to Berengar before the Council of Paris by Paulinus, or Paulus, the Precentor and Treasurer of Metz.[4] Paulinus was the friend of both Adelmann and

---

[1] Sudendorf, p. 116, quoting Mabillon, *Annales*, iv. Appendix, p. 752, and *Gallia Christiana*, viii. 304. (He appears as 'presbyter' in col. 303.)

[2] *Cf. infra*, p. 153 f.

[3] Traces of a lost writing of Berengar appear in the *De Beringerii Hæresiarchæ Damnatione Multiplici* of Bernold of Constance. He accuses him of calling Leo IX not 'Pope and Pontiff' but 'Braggart' (Pompifex) and 'Obesity' (Pulpifex); the Holy Roman Church, 'a council of vanity and church of malignants'; and the Roman bishopric, 'not apostolic but the seat of Satan' (Migne, 148, 1456b). The second and third of these statements are answered by Lanfranc in his *De Corpore Domini* (Migne, 150, 426a f.), so that Bernold may have quoted in part Berengar's first formal defence against the Papacy. The attack on the Church and Council was repeated in the *De Sacra Cœna*, pp. 44, 54, 58 f., 63, 65, 116. This pamphlet cannot be identified (as Schwabe identifies it, p. 109) with the one answered by Lanfranc (*infra*, p. 155 ff.) on the ground of similarity of phraseology. The latter pamphlet was not written till after the Roman Council of 1059, and so could not have been seen by Paulinus before the Council of Paris (1051). These epithets were frequently in Berengar's mind and became stock phrases in his writings.

[4] Martène and Durand, i. 196; Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 22; Sudendorf, p. 20 f. The date of the letter is fixed by a statement of Durand (Migne, 149, 1423a) that at the Council of Paris a letter which Berengar had sent to Paulinus was produced. This was Berengar's

Berengar, to whom the former had appealed for the conveyance of his first letter to Berengar. He says that he had been saddened by evil reports of the Scolasticus, but a letter from Berengar had now changed his sadness into joy. He hoped that God would complete the good work which He had begun in Berengar. He agreed that the teaching on the Eucharist, detailed in Berengar's letter, was conformable with that of the authorities quoted, and with Catholic belief. But Paulinus did not approve of his calling a distinguished person 'sacrilegious.' This can only refer to Leo IX, for no other Pope had yet vexed him and the term was used by Berengar of Leo in the *De Sacra Cœna*.[1] Paulinus says that the Abbot of Gorze, situated three miles from Metz, joined in the request that Berengar would write them a defence of the teaching of John the Scot,[2] and they urged him to be prudent in the Lord, and not to cast the inward meaning of Holy Scripture like pearls before swine, save when he had to give an account of his faith before others. Augustine in his book on heresies writes against schism, and Paulinus promises to send the extract as soon as possible.

This promise was evidently fulfilled, for Berengar made use of such a passage from Augustine in a long letter [3] written to

---

second letter to Paulinus. It referred to John the Scot in the terms requested in this letter of Paulinus to Berengar, and was written before the Council of Paris (October), and as Berengar's original letter referred slightingly to Leo, both his letters were written after Vercelli, and the replies of Paulinus also fall between these two dates—September 1, 1050, and October 16, 1051. Sudendorf decides for 1051 for Paulinus' first letter (quoted above), but if time is to be allowed for Berengar's second letter and Paulinus' second reply before October 16, 1051, it may well have been written at the end of 1050.

[1] *D.S.C.*, pp. 36, 42. *Cf.* Sudendorf, p. 20. Schwabe, p. 109, suggests that Berengar's phrase might refer to Humbert, so that 'P.'s' letter might refer in turn to Berengar's pamphlet on the Eucharist, of which we have extracts in Lanfranc's *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*. But Schwabe had not considered the fact that Berengar replied, and that Paulinus' second letter was intercepted before the Council of Paris (October 1051), a date far too early for Berengar's pamphlet.

[2] *Cf. infra*, p. 100.

[3] Sudendorf (pp. 204–208, *cf.* pp. 100–103) dates it at the end of 1050. *Cf.* Schnitzer, p. 38 ff. *La Vérité hist.*, iii. 190, doubts whether this letter was written by Berengar. Schwabe ignores it. There is some justification for hesitation. Sudendorf's reference to Josbert, the monk of Marmoutier (p. 101), is hardly relevant, save on Sudendorf's belief that Berengar was a monk of Marmoutier (*cf. supra*, p. 72 n. 6). The mode of address by which the writer refers to himself as 'queque digna egregio' is a breach

a distinguished personage, a layman, who may well have been Geoffrey of Anjou. It deals at length with a topic which frequently occupied the minds of the unruly magnates of the day—the mode and time of making sure of eternal salvation.

The writer 'B.' commends the monk Josbert of Marmoutier to 'J.' as a man worthy of the friendship of all good men. Josbert had recently come to 'B.' from Chemillé, where 'J.' had spoken kindly to him of 'B.,' and reported that a certain unknown person had wrongly persuaded 'J.' of the force of the words 'A sinner shall be saved in the hour in which he is converted and mourns.'[1] If properly considered, the words were not contrary to the Christian faith, and if God gave him an opportunity he would like to discuss the point with 'J.,' for he could not do so by letter, since the latter was not a learned man. But since no doubt some learned person would make known to him the contents of this letter, in the meantime he points out that many passages, if the literal statements of Scripture alone are followed, depart widely from the faith. For example, 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them.' If this is carelessly read it may be concluded that the Lord will seem to say that you may do unto

---

of humility which has no parallel in other letters of Berengar. Moreover, if written to Count Geoffrey, it is surprising that a stronger appeal for assistance was not made.

On the other hand, Sudendorf shows (p. 101) that the name 'Gaufredus' was often spelled 'Josfredus'; and there is some reference to Berengar's imprisonment ('si liberum mihi faceret vis divina loqui vobis,' an expression used, as Sudendorf points out, in Berengar's letter to Ascelin: Migne, 150, 66a). We may add that 'Josbert' is an alternative of 'Goisbert' or 'Gausbert.' We know of no other powerful layman to whom Berengar could have written at this time, and the reference to Chemillé in the county of Anjou is significant (*cf.* Sudendorf, p. 101). Moreover, on internal grounds it appears to be Berengar's. It reflects his imprisonment, and contains a passage which may cover an appeal for help; the reference to the dialectical method also suggests Berengar's thought; but the strongest evidence for his authorship, which was missed by Sudendorf, is forthcoming in the passage from Augustine on schism, which connects this letter with that of Paulinus of Metz to Berengar. As Paulinus' letter was not written till 1051, that must be the earliest date for this letter, and not 1050 as Sudendorf suggests. Schnitzer, p. 38 f., overstresses the force of 'De vestra erga me dilectione non solum mihi sed amicis meis nihil parum presumens' (Sudendorf, p. 204), which he translates 'das er, Berengar, für sich und seine Freunde nichts Geringes von Gottsfrieds Liebe zu erwarte,' and, following Sudendorf (p. 102), suggests that Geoffrey, taking the hint, secured his pardon. But was this possible at this time, when Geoffrey was at war with Henry I?

[1] *Cf.* Joel ii. 32.

others any evil that you are willing that they should do to you. Again, ‘ He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved ’ leads some to think that they may commit with impunity every crime and vice contrary to the apostle who said ‘ Faith without works is dead.’ So the words ‘ Whatsoever ye desire ’ must be interpreted ‘ Whatsoever ye rightly desire,’ since to desire wrongly is not the same as ‘ to desire,’ but is simply ‘ to desire wrongly.’ Consequently the words ‘ He that believeth and is baptised ’ must be read ‘ He that believeth so that he performs what he believes,’ so that he is not of those whom the apostle condemns when he says ‘ They profess that they know God, but in works they deny Him.’ [1] Thus, when it is said ‘ In the hour in which he is converted and mourns a sinner shall be saved,’ the passage refers either to that express conversion from infidelity to faith (and if he is baptised into this faith even at the point of death, he doubtless receives remission of all his sins, and if he dies immediately he is immediately taken from the power of darkness into the kingdom of light, the land of salvation), or it refers to those hours according to the Gospel well known to all who came often to church ; [2] or the meaning of the word ‘ converted ’ is to be ascertained from the force of the word, for no one is converted unless, as the Scripture saith, ‘ He could have transgressed, and did not ; he could have done evil, and did not.’ [3] Again, ‘ Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts.’ [4] This no man has power to do who lies ‘ in extremis.’ Commenting on this passage, Augustine writes to Peter the Deacon : [5] ‘ To every man in this life repentance can be profitable at any time that he uses it, no matter how sinful or aged he may be if he renounces his past sins whole-heartedly, and if he pours out before God, not merely the tears of the body, but of the heart, and takes care to wash away the stains of evil-doing by good works, he will speedily have pardon for all sins. This the Lord promised in the prophet saying “ If you, being converted, shall mourn, you shall be saved. . . .” No one ought, trusting in the mercy of God, to remain any longer in his sins, just as no one, trusting to future good health, desires to remain long sick. They who neglect to give up wrong-doing, relying on the mercy of God, are not seldom anticipated by the sudden anger of God, so that they find neither time for conversion nor the blessing of forgiveness.'

---

[1] Titus i. 16.

[2] Schnitzer, p. 39 n. 2, suggests that this refers to the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard in S. Matt. xx. 1–16.

[3] Ecclus. xxxi. 10.

[4] Isaiah lv 7.

[5] *De Fide*, iii.

The rest of the letter is occupied with a long extract from Augustine's Commentary on S. Matthew xi., on the difference between good and bad Catholics, and heretics and schismatics. An extract of this passage was probably sent to Berengar by Paulinus of Metz. Heretics are they who believe wrongly, bad Catholics are they who believe rightly but do not live up to their convictions. Schismatics are they who do not hold a different faith but break the fellowship of the Church. Yet it is doubtful whether both are to be counted among the tares, rather they should be compared with damaged ears of corn. . . . Nor does it follow that every heretic and schismatic should be cut off from communion with the Church. Indeed, if his doctrine is fundamentally wrong, a heretic is in spirit outside the Church, although within it in the body. The Church contains many of this kind, and they are not driven out unless their numbers become great. Schismatics through their conventicles or disturbances may be cut off from the unity of the Church in spirit, although because they are not discovered they share in the sacramental fellowship of the Church. Bad Catholics are they who, although believing the true doctrine, yet think they have a right to discuss things of which they are ignorant, and without hurt to their piety discuss the matter without any prejudgment of the truth ; or they are those who while loving and honouring as much as possible those who are good, or whom they think good, yet scandalously and evilly live contrary to what they believe. Although such may be reprimanded and suspended from Communion, they do not themselves think it necessary to withdraw from Catholic communion, always seeking an opportunity to return, and if death intervenes they remain straw to the end. Their desire to return is not moved by a sincere love but rather from fear of punishment. . . . For the sake of the unity of the Church they are not to be counted among the tares, for they are separate roots; nor among the stalks with ears of corn, but among the straw which will be separated at the winnowing. The characteristics of good Catholics are then described, and the letter ends with the statement that the time of the coming of the Son of Man is hidden, in order that despair may not make men more cold, but that desire may render them more capable of salvation. There are three kinds of soil which produce thirty-fold, sixty-fold, and a hundred-fold respectively. So the tares and heretics are to be tolerated down to the harvest.

This broad principle of toleration was seldom left on record in the eleventh century, yet the action of many leading churchmen in that day revealed it. The spirit of persecution, which grew increasingly as the Middle Ages advanced, and at length became their most cruel vice, was not yet abroad. It was tragic that one of its first victims was the man who made so noble an appeal for toleration. Several passages in the letter are characteristic of Berengar's thought and method of Scriptural exegesis.[1] Scripture, if taken at its face value, can lead into error. Reason, or common sense, must be applied if the truth underlying the words is to be reached. In the *De Sacra Cœna* we shall see that this application of the dialectical method, in order to supplement the authority of tradition, whether Scriptural or patristic, which here only outcrops while he discusses a disputed interpretation of a particular text, becomes the foundation of the whole system of Berengar's exegesis. The long quotation from Augustine on heretics and schismatics may reflect the charge of heresy which had been brought against Berengar himself, and may indicate that he realised that the day had arrived when he and his supporters would be proscribed as heretics.

---

[1] 'Si sequamini verba sola, longe a fidei ratione recedant' (Sudendorf, p. 204).

CHAPTER VI

THE COUNCIL OF PARIS AND SYNOD OF TOURS

Berengar was an unfortunate correspondent. The wanderings of a letter written by him in 1049, ending with the dramatic production of the letter at the Council of Rome in 1050, made Lanfranc his lifelong enemy. A similar mischance to a letter written by him to Paulinus of Metz, and produced in an equally dramatic way at the Council of Paris, ruined any possibility that Henry I might be persuaded to befriend him. The Council met on October 16, 1051.[1]

---

[1] Lessing, p. 130 ff., and Gieseler, ii. pt. i. 240, hold that the account of the Council of Paris is fictitious. Schröckh, xxiii. 521 f., cannot decide the point. Durand (Migne, 149, 1421c) fixes accurately the day of the month, but the year 1053 (*ibid.* 1422c) given by him is wrong, and has misled some modern writers, viz. Gfrörer, *Kirchengesch.*, iv. pt. i. 586; *Greg. VII*, iii. 275, vi. 723. The chronology is discussed at length by Heurtevent, p. 155 n. 3; Schnitzer, p. 50 n. 1; and Sudendorf, p. 30 f.

Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 21; *Vet. Analect.*, p. 513; Natalis Alexander, vi. 669; Oudin, ii. 628; Bouquet, xi. 527c; De Roye, p. 41; *Hist. Litt.*, viii. 205; Mansi, xix. 781, 785 f.; Stäudlin, ii. 34; Neander, vi. 318 n. 4, all date the Council in 1050, on the ground that the letter of Theoduin to Henry, which was concerned with it, makes no reference to the Council of Vercelli (September 1, 1050). Will, i. 66 n. 17, 76 n. 33, holds that the report of Durand supplies compelling reasons for placing the Council among the events of 1050. But if it had been held in the autumn of 1050 Berengar would have been present. Henry I would not have released him until it had taken place (*cf.* Lessing, p. 135 f.). Heurtevent shows that Henry would not have held the Council in the autumn of 1050, because the Pope was then in the neighbourhood. We may add that time must be allowed for the report of Vercelli to reach the clergy of Chartres, and for their machinations, which issued in the Council of Paris.

The date 1051 is supplied by the *Annales Elnonenses Minores* (*Mon. Ger. SS.*, v. 20; Martène and Durand, iii. 1396b) and the *Chron. Elnonense S. Amandi* (Bouquet, xi. 344), and is followed by Bulaeus, i. 421; Sudendorf, p. 31; Héfélé–Leclercq, iv. pt. ii. 1061 ff.; Herzog, *Realencyklopädie*, ii. 609; Delarc, *Rev. des Questions hist.*, xx. 151; Höfler, ii. 182; Schwabe, p. 68; Schnitzer, p. 50; Heurtevent, p. 155. Some of the writers give October 15 instead of 16. Gfrörer (*Greg. VII*, iii. 274) makes the extraordinary statement that the Council of Paris was inspired by

Whether the long delay between the release of Berengar in the autumn of 1050 and the assembly of this Council [1] was due to Theoduin's letter to Henry I, or to hesitancy on the part of the King to credit the reports of the Chartrains, who began their machinations against Berengar soon after his release, is not clear. Perhaps it was the result of the cautious and weak attitude which Henry showed throughout the controversy.

Berengar did not obey the summons to appear.[2] He had indeed expressed a desire for a public inquiry before Henry,[3] but apparently he distrusted the intentions of the authorities who were to meet at Paris.[4] More probably he was dissuaded by Eusebius, Bishop of Angers, with whom he was staying [5]—a move in the game of Angevine politics against Henry I.

The proceedings of the Council were vague but excitable. For the first time a definite written statement of the views of Berengar, signed by his own hand, had been ostensibly produced. The Council consequently possessed evidence which had been wanting at Rome and Vercelli. With the permission of the King, Isembert,[6] Archbishop of Orleans, began to read a letter to the assembly which sat with 'ears wide open and mouths shut.'[7] This was the reply of Berengar to the request of Paulinus of Metz and the Abbot of Gorze for a formal explanation of the teaching of John the Scot.[8] It had been intercepted by the Archbishop of Orleans. As he

---

William of Normandy against Henry I, but Schwabe (p. 66) says that it was directed by Henry against Geoffrey.

Heurtevent shows that the statement of the *Annales Elnonenses* is confirmed by *Normanniae Nova Chron.* (*Mon. Ger. SS.*, vi. 359; Bouquet, xi. 164). The *Chron. Bec.* (Migne, 150, 643c) reproduces the statement of Sigebert's *Norm. Nov. Chron.*

[1] Brucker, ii. 171, says that Henry summoned the Council at the royal gathering at Vitry in 1051, when his bride, Anne of Russia, was welcomed.

[2] Durand (Migne, 149, 1422d); *Annales Elnon. Min.* (*Mon. Ger. SS.*, v. 20).

[3] *Cf.* 'Epis. to Richard,' *supra*, p. 90 f.

[4] Schnitzer, p. 51, suggests that he had in mind the fate of the heretics who were burned at Orleans in 1022. *Cf. infra*, p. 245.

[5] Schnitzer, p. 51, says that Eusebius had been summoned, but Durand hardly says this.

[6] *Gallia Christiana*, viii. 1437d–1438b. He was Archbishop of Orleans 1033–59.

[7] 'omnium aures eriguntur, ora in silentium componuntur.'

[8] *Cf. supra*, p. 94.

proceeded, murmurs of disapproval and then shouts of dissent broke forth, and when he had finished Berengar was condemned, together with the book of John the Scot 'from which the offending statements appeared to have been taken,' and the hasty and sensational resolution was formed of proceeding against Berengar and his supporters 'with the whole army of France,' headed by the clergy 'in ecclesiastical robes,' and wherever they met with the offenders, they should be offered the alternative of submission to the Catholic faith or death. This proscription was framed in the old Frankish manner which had offered baptism or death to the Saxon patriots in the time of Charles the Great; it also savoured of the method of the anti-heretical Crusades, which were soon to break out. Durand says that, terrified by this threat, the offenders soon gave way, and accepted the Catholic faith with an oath over the relics of the saints, at a council especially convened for this purpose. What council was this? Possibly the statement only refers to a method of procedure decided upon at Paris, and carried out when some of the recalcitrants were afterwards dealt with.[1] Durand naïvely closes his report by saying that he has omitted an account of the apostasy which afterwards took place[2]—a confession that no tangible result followed upon the proscription. It is certain that the 'whole army of France' would have a difficult campaign to secure Berengar. It would have been faced by the whole army of Anjou, led by Geoffrey the Hammer, his powerful protector. Possibly the account refers to a new phase in the hostilities between Henry I and Geoffrey, and indicates that the King was now deliberately using Berengar as an excuse for sharpening his action against the Count. However that may be, soon after these events Henry I and Geoffrey were at peace, and we hear no more of hostile proceedings conducted by the King against Berengar.[3]

At Paris an opportunity was missed of beginning proceedings against Berengar which might have ended the controversy, if the Papacy had been willing to ingratiate Henry by formally sanctioning the proceedings. A general resolution of condemnation might have been adopted, and the whole case could then have been referred to the Curia, together with the incriminating document produced by the Archbishop of Orleans. What became of this important letter is unknown. If it ever reached the Papacy it was suppressed, for we do not read that it was produced at Tours in 1054 or at Rome in 1059. Possibly after the conclusion of the peace with Geoffrey [1] it was destroyed at the King's orders, but for this there is no evidence. That the letter disappeared is proved by Berengar's own statement that at the Synod of Tours (1054) the Archbishop of Orleans was only able to report the evidence of rumour against him.[2] This suggests the suppression of the letter by royal authority, unless the letter read at Paris was only a forged copy of the one written by Berengar, which Isembert feared to produce before the more competent and experienced eye of Hildebrand at Tours.

---

[1] Unless he refers to the Synod of Tours of 1054. *Cf. infra*, p. 103 ff.

[2] Migne, 149, 1424a.

[3] Pletteau, p. 20, suggests that Henry realised that Berengar was embarrassing the Papacy.

---

[1] Concluded not later than August 15, 1052. On that date Geoffrey and his wife Grecie witnessed a document in the presence of Henry I (Halphen, pp. 76, 123 n. 3 ; 277, no. 111). Gervase, Bishop of Le Mans, had already obtained his release (Halphen, pp. 75, 125), and the ban of excommunication on Geoffrey, and the interdict on Anjou, were raised by Leo IX (Bröcking, p. 79). Halphen, p. 125, accepts Bröcking's conclusion with reserve. Bröcking dates the removal of the ban at the latest by the end of 1053, on the ground that (i) Geoffrey wrote to Leo IX at the end of 1053 (Sudendorf, p. 212 ff.) ; (ii) Victor II wrote to Geoffrey and his wife (Jaffé–Löwenfeld, no. 4352). We may accept Bröcking's conclusion on the cogency of the letter of Victor, but not on the relevancy of the letter of Geoffrey. Schwabe's (p. 75) date for this letter is preferable. He places it in 1051–52. To his statement may be added the evidence of the letter itself, which shows that at the time when Geoffrey wrote he was still at war with Henry I (Sudendorf, p. 214) : 'nunc per suos . . . Franciae regem concitat in pervasionem . . . et bellicam devastationem.' The humble tone of the letter reflects Geoffrey's difficulties before the peace with Henry was effected (*cf.* Halphen, pp. 74–76). It is doubtful whether he would have written so submissively to Leo after that event. Sudendorf, p. 118, dates this letter 1053–54. Loofs, p. 573 (criticising Schwabe), and Schnitzer, p. 52, associate it with events leading up to the Synod of Tours (1054).

But Bröcking, p. 79 n. 2, rightly corrects Schwabe's statement, p. 85, that Geoffrey remained under the ban until his death. Schwabe contended that the letter of Berengar (Sudendorf, p. 232) was concerned with Geoffrey, but Sudendorf, p. 196 ff. (followed by Bröcking, p. 79 n. 2), shows that it refers to Gregory VII. Geoffrey's release from the ban is also indicated by the fact that he died in a monk's habit at S. Nicholas, Angers, November 14, 1060. *Cf.* Halphen, p. 12 n. 1, for the authorities.

[2] *D.S.C.*, p. 51.

SYNOD OF TOURS (1054)

Three years after the assembly of Touraingelle and Angevine clergy at Tours in the spring or summer of 1051, another and more famous synod was gathered together in that city, at which Berengar received more favourable treatment than he had ever experienced before, or was to meet for ever afterwards. The genesis of this phase of the controversy is to be seen in the cessation of hostilities and in the development of a rapprochement between Geoffrey and Henry I, which took place not later than August 1052. The result of the earlier Synod of Tours, a year or so before that event, was not lost upon the Curia. There was a danger lest, with the declaration of peace between King and Count, and the withdrawal of Henry from the persecution of Berengar, the teaching of the Archdeacon might gain a hold in France and Anjou, beyond the power of the Papacy to check.[1] Up to this point the attitude of the Curia, if not wavering, had at least been one of opportunist manipulation of the eucharistic question, and especially of the fortunes of Berengar, in the interest of the political policy of the Papacy in France and Anjou. Even so early in the Middle Ages, politics, not religion, engaged the attention of the astute ecclesiastics at Rome, and the case of Berengar was the first instance where the natural development of religious doctrine, and the personal rights of an individual, were sacrificed to the growing political programme and necessities of the Papacy. In the spring of 1054 opportunism and expediency gave the cue for the change of front among the papal diplomatists which was about to be inaugurated.[2] Yet the influence of new personalities on the controversy was making itself felt. Henceforth at Rome there were two parties on the Berengarian question.[3]

---

[1] *Cf.* Schwabe, p. 77 f.

[2] Heurtevent, p. 161 n. 1, contends that at Tours in 1054 for the first time the question was treated from a dogmatic point of view, and he implies that previously to this the authorities had adopted no exclusive attitude to Berengar (p. 160). The latter statement is, at any rate, justified.

[3] Schwabe, p. 78, and Reuter, i. 119. Schnitzer, p. 57 n. 1, declines to admit the existence of two parties at Rome. But he says that while united in dogma the cardinals may have divided on the question of the

The rigorous dogmatists were led by Humbert,[1] supported by Lanfranc.[2] In their hostility to Berengar and his teaching they never wavered, and in the end secured his utter defeat. But not for a quarter of a century. In the meantime Hildebrand and Peter Damiani came to the front. The former was a new and rising hope among the practical reformers of the Church, and was therefore in complete sympathy with the rigid aims of Humbert and his following, yet Hildebrand always considered rather the practical ends of politics than of dogma as being the true concern of the Church. This did not mean that Hildebrand was any less zealous for the reform of clerical life or the revival of spiritual religion, but it did imply that he was prepared to allow considerable latitude to the form in which doctrine was expressed, provided that the fundamental teaching of the Church was at least tacitly admitted. Moreover, the simplicity and perfection of Berengar's personal life, and his obvious sympathy with the practical aims of the reforming movement, could not fail to deflect the attention of a practical mind like Hildebrand's from the real implications of his eucharistic teaching.

Besides Hildebrand there was at the arm of the Curia another moderating spirit, of equal zeal on behalf of practical reform, in the person of Peter Damiani. Damiani[3] possessed the spiritual vision which Hildebrand lacked, and with encouragement might have passed from a halting refusal to condemn Berengar into a generous appreciation of the Archdeacon's somewhat self-assertive mode of handling the sensitive fibres of Catholic teaching. He might have accepted the Berengarian doctrine, and with the touch of the saint he

---

treatment of one who denied it. But however aptly this criticism may apply to Reuter, it is hardly relevant to Schwabe, who says nothing about a division on Church doctrine, but discusses the different attitude of the cardinals to Berengar's heresy.

[1] On Humbert *cf.* Whitney, *Camb. Hist. Journ.*, i. 3 (1925), p. 225 ff.

[2] *Cf.* the Council of Rome: *infra*, p. 127 ff.

[3] *Cf.* Hildebrand's appeal, at the Council of Rome 1078, to Damiani's support of Berengar (*infra*, p. 186). On the influence of Hildebrand and Damiani *cf.* Schwabe, p. 78 ff. Loofs, p. 573, questions his conclusions, especially with regard to Damiani, but allows ' his little nuances of dogmatico-historical painting ' to pass (' kleine Nüancen der dogmengeschichtlichen Farbengebung '). *Cf.* Whitney, *Camb. Hist. Journ.*, i. 3 (1925), p. 242.

might have moulded it into a winsome expression of spiritual truth, capable of attracting the wild illiterate minds of medieval Europe, with far better results for religion and culture than the Radbertian miracles and cultus were able to achieve. There is a catholicism of man's spirit which moves along the heights of advancing human endeavour, just as there is a catholicism of his behaviour which keeps his feet dragging heavily along the trenches of mere ecclesiasticism. It is the difference between a Francis and an Ignatius Loyola.

But Damiani, like Hildebrand, took no active part in the reform of dogma or development of doctrine. His interest lay even more narrowly within the confines of practical reform. Hildebrand shaped his policy with the object of bringing ever, more and more, the relations between Church and State under the dominance of the Curia. Reform for him meant something much wider than the Cluniac ideal of the revival of the Benedictine life and the enfranchisement of the secular clergy from the sway of territorial magnates. It meant the definite entry of the Church into the civil politics of the European state-system, in order there to occupy a dominating position.[1] Damiani, on the contrary, was content to limit his activities to the revival of monastic life ;[2] to the removal of illiteracy from the clergy by the aid of the study of the liberal arts as an introduction to theology ;[3] to the reform of their morals by the suppression of simony and clerical marriage,[4] without manifesting the harsh zeal of Humbert ;[5] to the reform of ecclesiastical administration by opposing lay-election.[6] His attitude to the Emperor Henry III, whose influence on the reform of the Church Damiani supported with unflinching consistency throughout the Emperor's life,[7] was something more than the idea that without the Emperor's support the practical reform of the Church was impossible. In Damiani's view the Emperor remained predominant over the Pope in civil affairs,[1] although towards the end of his life he became a more zealous supporter of the Papacy.[2]

---

[1] On the use made of the Berengarian controversy for political objects by Hildebrand and the Papacy, *cf.* Schwabe, p. 77. Loofs, p. 572, agrees with some reservation.

[2] Neukirch, p. 23.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 32.

[4] *Ibid.* pp. 26, 43 f., 68 f., 81.

[5] Schwabe, p. 78, describes him as 'der ehrlichste und getreichste unter den Vorkämpfern clunyacensischer Papstpolitik.'

[6] Neukirch, p. 71 f.

[7] *Ibid.* pp. 50 ff., 63 f., 87.

His attitude on the Berengarian controversy is somewhat obscure. On at least one occasion he seems to have publicly championed Berengar,[3] and he refrained from attending any council at which the latter was condemned.[4] Doubtless the entanglement of the Archdeacon in the political relations of Anjou and of France with the Curia caused him to regard the question with caution. If he had seen the *De Sacra Cœna*, its whole-hearted application of the dialectic method to the reform of dogma must have confirmed his hesitation. Although he failed to realise the value of dialectics as an aid to the interpretation of belief,[5] Damiani, like Berengar, had been trained in the old classical tradition,[6] and we shall see that there is evidence that he preferred the teaching of Berengar to that of Lanfranc,[7] and was able to impress his opinion on the mind of Hildebrand. Therein lay the opportunity for the medieval Church to rescue the Berengarian system from the polemical heat which was being generated, partly by the temperament of Berengar himself and the mental aggravation set up by his misfortunes. The absence of any response in Damiani to the call of high dogmatics prevented him from removing even the contradictions in thought which mark his own writings,[8] much less from intervening in the doctrinal discussion occasioned by the eucharistic controversy.[9] Hildebrand, who showed more appreciation of the merits of Berengarianism, was too wedded to the absorbing interests of statecraft to follow them up, but his allusion to the opinion of Damiani at the Council of Rome in 1078 indicated the avenue of possibility which opened along Hildebrand's intellectual outlook, for a mentor of Damiani's milder temperament, to secure a union between Hildebrand and Berengar, if Damiani had possessed clear dogmatic aims. But to the end Hildebrand was Damiani's 'holy Satan,' [1] and without the assistance that Damiani might have given, Hildebrand, who was privately impressed by Berengar's teaching,[2] and who publicly always remained under the influence of his personal attraction, from first to last treated the controversy merely as a political factor.[3]

---

[1] Neukirch, p. 86.

[2] Whitney, *Camb. Hist. Journ.*, i. 3 (1925), p. 244 ff.

[3] *Cf.* the statement of Gregory VII at Rome in 1078 (Martène and Durand, iv. 103b). Neukirch, p. 58, misunderstands this passage, and assigns the statement to Berengar himself.

[4] Schwabe, p. 80 n. 1.

[5] Endres, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philos. des Mittelalters*, xviii. Heft iii. 78 ff.

[6] Neukirch, p. 14; Schwabe, p. 79.

[7] Schwabe, p. 78 f., thinks there was a fundamental similarity of mind between Damiani and Berengar, and contends that we have a credible witness that he gave the Berengarian teaching direct and open support.

[8] Schwabe, p. 79, draws attention to his belief in the miracles associated with the Mass. On the Eucharist and on political matters Damiani was confused in thought.

[9] This conclusion must be modified if we accept the *Expositio Canonis Missae* as the work of Damiani. But *cf. infra*, pp. 333 n. 4, 402 n. 1. Endres, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philos. des M.-A.*, xviii. Heft iii. 10 n. 1, holds that even if Damiani took no part in the controversy, his writings show that he was affected by it.

The selection of Tours for the assembly of the Synod is significant. It suggests more than the hesitancy of the Curia to risk another rebuff from Henry I by ordering it to meet on royal territory. The peace between Henry and Geoffrey was the result of events in Anjou and Normandy. On the death of Hugh, Count of Maine, the citizens surrendered Le Mans to Geoffrey, and Henry I was now amenable to Geoffrey's hostile plans against the Norman Duke.[4] Geoffrey was more than ever the dominant political figure in Gaul. Throughout this stage of the eucharistic controversy Angevine rather than French politics took precedence in the papal policy in the West. Moreover, from the point of view of ecclesiastical affairs, Tours was a vital centre. It was the one place in France or Anjou where the papal policy had been ignored. The interdict laid upon the territories of Geoffrey had been disregarded, and Berengar was openly supported by the clergy of S. Martin's. It was necessary to deprive the clergy of Tours and Angers of their influence upon the course of the controversy and to neutralise the assistance given by Geoffrey to the Archdeacon. The eucharistic question had now assumed for the Papacy a proportion equal to that of other questions outstanding between it and the Count, such as the imprisonment of Gervase of Le Mans. Not only was the orthodox faith of the West threatened by the rapprochement between Henry and Geoffrey, but the latter was now free to make unhindered use of Berengar for his political aims. The eucharistic question possessed larger political significance than ever.[1] The matter required careful handling. Any hasty condemnation of Berengar, such as had been issued, perhaps with sound political insight at Rome and Vercelli, was not possible at Tours, where Geoffrey could not be struck at through his protégé. Humbert therefore was not selected for the business, but the more amenable and versatile Hildebrand, whose sympathy with Berengar was probably observed at Rome. Two years before, in the midst of his difficulties, Geoffrey had written to Leo IX, asking for the despatch of a papal legate to examine his case against Gervase,[2] and although Geoffrey's affairs were now in a prosperous condition, he was unlikely to raise objection to an embassy which fulfilled his own request, especially as his success in France rather imposed an appellant attitude on the Curia.

---

[1] 'Epis. 16 to Alexander II and Hildebrand' (Migne, 144, 236a).

[2] Schwabe, p. 119, cannot decide whether Hildebrand was a Berengarian at heart or not, but thinks that he was not convinced of heresy in Berengar.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 80.

[4] Halphen, pp. 74–77.

The Synod assembled at Tours in the spring of 1054,[3] at

---

[1] Schnitzer, p. 52 n. 5, and Bröcking, p. 89, hold that the case of Berengar was only of minor importance at Tours, and that matters of general Church reform engaged the chief attention of the Synod.

[2] Sudendorf, p. 213.

[3] The date has been a matter of dispute. Berengar states clearly that it took place in the pontificate of Leo IX (*D.S.C.*, p. 50 f.), who sent Hildebrand as his ambassador. Lanfranc (Migne, 150, 413d) reports that it took place under Victor II, and this statement was vigorously disputed by Berengar.

Lanfranc's testimony influenced the following writers: Bernold of Constance (*Chronicon* in *Mon. Ger. SS.*, v. 427; *De Ber. Mult. Damn.* [Rieberer, p. 70 ff.], although he gives the year 1056, a date repeated in *Mon. Ger. SS.*, v. 387); Milo Crispin (Migne, 150, 36b); Orderic Vitalis (Le Prévost, ii. 211); William of Malmesbury (*G.R.*, p. 338); and Alberic of the Three Fountains (Bouquet, xi. 355a).

The Synod of Tours dated 1055 by the 'Chron. of Vendôme' (Marchegay and Mabille, p. 167) and by the 'Chron. of S. Maxentius' (Marchegay and Mabille, p. 398) refers not to the synod of 1054 when Berengar's case was heard, but to another synod held by Hildebrand in the province of Lyons, probably at Tours, in 1055, at which simony was discussed, and possibly the affairs of the Church in Spain (*cf.* Bouquet, xi. 525; Brucker, ii. 350 n. 1). Bouquet, xi. 524b, quotes an old document of S. Martin's to the effect that Hildebrand in later years referred to the discussion at Tours on the case of Berengar *in the time of Victor*. But Sudendorf (p. 46) points out that this source is doubtful, and probably contains a scribe's error. But as Victor was already dead when the Synod was sitting (*infra*, p. 109 n. 1), Hildebrand may have referred deliberately the end of April, and at the time when it was sitting Leo IX was dead.[1] While waiting for the arrival of the clergy who had been summoned, Hildebrand appears to have had an interview with Berengar.[2] The Archdeacon had expected him as

---

to his successor, elected April 1055. The Synod is reported by Guitmund (Hurter, xxxviii. 164).

Among modern writers Lanfranc's date is followed by Mabillon (*Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 23; *Annales*, iv. 549; *Vet. Analecta*, p. 514; but Mabillon runs the accounts of the Synods of 1054 and 1055 together); de Roye, p. 58 f.; Ceillier, xx. 290; and many recent accounts such as De Crozals, p. 95 f., and the *Dic. Nat. Biog.* (art. 'Lanfranc'). Will, ii. 50 ff., rejects Berengar's account and distrusts his veracity. He charges him with corrupting Lanfranc's text. He defends Lanfranc's statement (p. 58 ff.) and claims support from an old Spanish document reported by John Mariana (*cf.* Bouquet, xi. 525d). But this reference concerns the Council of Florence which also met in 1055. Will repeated his views in the *Theologische Quartalschrift* (1862), p. 213 ff.

Berengar's report was first championed by Lessing (p. 143 ff.). He noted the two synods of Tours, one in 1054 (p. 152) when Berengar's case came up, and the other in 1055 when the Spanish business was discussed (p. 154). The question is fully treated by Sudendorf, pp. 41–47, and Héfélé–Leclercq, iv. pt. ii. 1108 f., who decide for 1054, the date followed by the *Hist. Litt.*, viii. 207; Schnitzer, p. 52 f.; Delarc, *Rev. des Questions hist.*, xx. 152; and Schwabe, p. 81.

[1] Sudendorf, p. 130, places it before April 19, but the discussion was cut short by the announcement to Hildebrand of Leo IX's death on April 19 (*D.S.C.*, p. 53). The messenger from Rome would take two or three weeks for the journey, and as the Synod had only been in session for a few days, the Pope's death had actually taken place before it assembled.

Victor II was not elected until April 13, 1055, but Lanfranc may have dated back his pontificate to cover the period of the vacancy in the papal chair (*cf.* my *Lanfranc*, p. 47 n. 2). Yet his statement that Victor's legates were present at Tours suggests that his recollection or information was inaccurate. He was not present at the Synod, although Orderic Vitalis (Le Prévost, ii. 211) states the contrary. Berengar was therefore justified in denying that the legates of Pope Victor had conducted the inquiry (*D.S.C.*, pp. 49, 50, 53), and he states quite accurately that Hildebrand came to Tours in the time of Pope Leo ('Tempore non Victoris, sed Papae Leonis . . . Hildebrannus . . . Turoni adfuit'). He must have arrived not later than the beginning of April in order to issue the citations and give opportunity for those summoned to assemble. Brucker, ii. 350 n. 1, ingeniously suggests that Lanfranc uses 'ipsius' of Leo and 'iste' of Victor, and so his account can be harmonised with Berengar's.

[2] There is some doubt whether this preliminary interview took place. Sudendorf, p. 130; Schnitzer, p. 54; and Ébersolt, p. 37, all record it. By combining the statement in Geoffrey's letter to Hildebrand (Sudendorf, p. 215 ff.) with those in the *D.S.C.* (p. 50), a case can be made out for it. Geoffrey says (Sudendorf, p. 217): 'Nec me latet, sicut tibi etiam ipse B. testimonium perhibebat, consulto et quasi rationibili conversatione talem te illo in tempore exhibere voluisse.' This statement is not quoted by Schnitzer, p. 54. He refers only to Geoffrey's earlier remark (Sudendorf, p. 216): 'Tu B. causam agere et sine turba, postquam convenerunt adversarii ipsius, eum convenire timuisti.' These statements certainly suggest a private interview, which may be covered by Berengar's own

'an angel of light,'[1] and was delighted with Hildebrand's amenable attitude. Whether it was on this occasion that he vindicated his teaching by the long quotations from Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory referred to in his formal account of the proceedings,[2] he certainly came so completely under Hildebrand's influence that, when the legate urged him in the Synod to accompany him to Rome, Berengar agreed to go.[3]

The Synod assembled in the Church of S. Maurice,[4] and included Bartholomew, Archbishop of Tours; Isembert, Archbishop of Orleans; Geoffrey, Bishop of Auxerre;[5] Walter, Abbot of S. Aubin's, Angers;[6] and the two friends of Berengar, Eusebius, Bishop of Angers, and Albert, Abbot of Marmoutier.[7] The presence of Isembert is noteworthy. He was a well-known enemy of Berengar, and his appearance indicates that Hildebrand was seeking all information possible, although, as the Synod was also concerned with Geoffrey's affair with Gervase and with the general reform of the Church,[8] the Archbishop of Lyons would certainly be included in the citations. Hildebrand was anxious for a brief and orderly discussion of Berengar's case, and as the bishops began to arrive in Tours, he appears to have avoided any further private interview with Berengar.[9] The Archdeacon's enemies were

---

account (*D.S.C.*, p. 50): 'Huic contra calumpniam in me . . . satisfacere . . . omnino sufficio'; although without support from Geoffrey's letter this passage might equally well refer to the proceedings of the Synod.

[1] 'Epis. of Geoffrey' (Sudendorf, p. 216).

[2] *D.S.C.*, p. 50.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 50.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 51: 'in ecclesia Sancti Maurici.' Sudendorf, p. 131, wrongly says S. Martin's. S. Maurice was the cathedral church at Tours. Originally it consisted of the house of S. Lidore, the first bishop of Tours. S. Gregory of Tours rebuilt this church (590). It was rebuilt again in the twelfth century by Hildebert of Lavardin. The name of S. Maurice was not definitely associated with it until *c.* 720, and in the thirteenth century it became known as S. Gatien, a name which it holds to-day (Boissonnot, p. 5 ff.). The first church contained the bones of Gatien (Maan, cap. xv., quoting *Vita Martini* and *Martyrol. Turonensi*). But Maan's statement that S. Martin built and dedicated this church to S. Maurice is erroneous, yet it is repeated by Besse, p. 7. Baronius (*cf.* Boissonnot, p. 5 n. 3), Sudendorf (*supra*, p. 72 n. 6), and others confused S. Martin's and S. Maurice. Salmon, *Rec. de Chron. de Touraine*, pp. 461, 476 etc., distinguishes them.

[5] *D.S.C.*, p. 51.

[6] 'Epis. of Geoffrey' (Sudendorf, pp. 218 f., 131).

[7] *D.S.C.*, p. 52.

[8] *Ibid.* pp. 51, 53. Berengar refers to other business.

[9] Sudendorf, p. 216: 'postquam convenerunt adversarii ipsius, eum convenire timuisti.'

loudly publishing their hostility, yet, if many of the clergy from a distance were hostile, Berengar had many friends in Tours, who were convinced, according to Count Geoffrey's statement, that Berengar's teaching could be vindicated from orthodox authorities, and who expected a favourable decision from Hildebrand on behalf of the Scolasticus.[1]

When the Synod opened its proceedings, Hildebrand proposed to the bishops that they should either conduct a lengthy examination of the case themselves, when he would place before them certain books which he had collected together, and in which he had marked certain passages ; or, putting a plain question to Berengar, and being contented for the time being with his reply, they should allow the case to be decided finally at Rome, and in the meantime proceed to other business. The bishops adopted the substance of the second proposal by suggesting that a private examination of Berengar should be conducted by the Archbishop of Lyons, the Bishop of Auxerre, and the Archbishop of Tours together with their clergy.[2]

To this procedure Hildebrand agreed. The committee adjourned from the Synod, and at the opening of its inquiry the Archbishop of Orleans and the Bishop of Auxerre made a grumbling complaint that Berengar's affair had dragged them away from their dioceses. They alleged that he taught that the consecrated bread of the altar was not different from the unconsecrated bread of common use. But they failed to produce a witness for this statement. What had become of the incriminating letter produced by the Archbishop of Orleans three years before at Paris ? Was it a forged copy of one of Berengar's letters which the Archbishop feared to submit to Hildebrand's committee ?[3] After allowing that the charge was a slander, the committee urged Berengar to state his belief on the Eucharist. He stated that he certainly held that 'the bread and wine of the altar, after consecration, are the true body and blood of Christ.' [1] The bishops answered that the other members of the Synod in the Church of S. Maurice would like to hear this statement, and then they could all go about their own business. Berengar agreed; the committee returned to S. Maurice's Church, and there Berengar publicly repeated his statement. But this did not satisfy all the members of the Synod. Some said that he uttered one thing with his mouth and believed another in his heart, and they demanded that he should confirm his declaration with an oath. Then someone cried out that everyone should be excommunicated who did not avow that the bread and wine ceased to exist on the altar after consecration.[2] To this interruption Hildebrand made no answer. Berengar thought that the demand for an oath was unfair, because no one who could substantiate the charge brought against him had been produced, but he yielded to the advice of his friends, Eusebius, Bishop of Angers, and the Abbot of Marmoutier, who were persuaded, he says, that he sincerely believed his declaration, and that it was supported by the authority of the Fathers. They urged that he should not lose the opportunity of appeasing the tumult which had arisen. So Berengar wrote down the statement that 'the bread and wine of the altar after consecration are the true body and blood of Christ,' and after reading it aloud, swore on oath that what he had said with his lips he believed with his heart.[3]

---

[1] 'Epis. of Geoffrey' (Sudendorf, p. 217) : 'Omnes enim qui eruditione aliqua apud nos preminebant . . . testimonium ferebant, recte B. sentire. . . .'

[2] *D.S.C.*, p. 50 f.

[3] Lessing, p. 136 f., sees in this incident a proof of the falseness of Durand's statement concerning the letter read at Paris. *Cf.* Gfrörer, *Kirchengesch.*, iv. pt. i. 589.

At some point during the proceedings the Abbot of S. Aubin's and others attempted to shelve the discussion by urging that they were not required to state how the eucharistic body and blood of Christ came to be. Hildebrand answered that the point could not be left in doubt, lest the people should be led astray into error.[4] But he persuaded the Synod to remain content with Berengar's statement and oath, on the understanding that he should accompany the legate to Rome.[1] Hildebrand then turned to other business with which he had been entrusted at Rome.[2] Some time was spent upon this, when the report reached the legate that Leo IX was dead. The Synod broke up, and Berengar seized the opportunity to escape from his promise to accompany Hildebrand to Rome.[3]

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 51: 'panem atque vinum altaris post consecrationem Christi esse revera corpus et sanguinem.'

[2] 'Epis. of Gregory' (Sudendorf, p. 216; *cf.* n. 5).

[3] *D.S.C.*, p. 51 f. Delarc, p. 152, thinks that Berengar showed himself more tractable at Tours.

[4] 'Epis. of Geoffrey' (Sudendorf, p. 218). The passage is obscure: 'non esse ejusmodi negotium istud, id est disquirere, qualiter vivendum sit Christiano de corpore Christi et sanguine.' Sudendorf, p. 218 n. 19, suggests the emendation 'credendum' for 'vivendum,' and translates the passage (p. 131) 'der Streit betreffe ja gar nicht die Frage, wie ein Christ leben, sondern nur, was er über dem Abendmahl glauben solle,' which is accepted by Schnitzer, p. 54.

The behaviour of Hildebrand at the Synod of Tours has caused much discussion to arise.[4] It was not approved by

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, pp. 50, 51, 53.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 53 : 'pro quibus a Romana ecclesia venerat, est prosecutus negotia.' Schwabe, p. 77, holds that the eucharistic question was the chief business discussed at the Synod. Bröcking, p. 89 n. 1, criticising Schwabe, thinks that it met primarily to discuss general Church reform.

[3] *D.S.C.*, p. 53.

[4] In my *Lanfranc*, p. 47, I have stressed too strongly the independent line taken by Hildebrand at Tours, and the statement that it was agreed to allow the controversy to die away in France before Berengar went to Rome has no authority behind it save Neander's (vi. 320). The passage which Neander quotes from the *D.S.C.* is hardly relevant. But the older writers adopted a similar view of Hildebrand's intervention on behalf of Berengar. Schröckh, xxiii. 523, thinks he was a supporter of Berengar's teaching. Stäudlin, ii. 46, decides that Hildebrand did not oppose him, and appeared to justify him, while advising him to go to Rome, where his own influence with Leo would be in his favour. Neander, vi. 320, holds that Hildebrand mediated between Berengar and the Synod. On p. 321 he attributes a mental reservation to Berengar, which was really the answer given by Hildebrand to the Abbot of S. Aubin's (*cf.* Sudendorf, p. 218). Gfrörer, *Kirchengesch.*, iv. pt. i. 590 f., says that the Curia made use of Berengar's defeat at Paris to send Hildebrand, who was not deceived by Berengar at Tours, and because he personally attached no importance to the doctrine of the conversion ('Wandlung') of the elements, he declared himself satisfied with Berengar's oath. Will, *Theolog. Quartalschrift* (1862), p. 216 f., thinks that Hildebrand was fully empowered to deal with the case at Tours. Martens, i. 247 : Hildebrand referred the case to Rome because he could not decide it. He fell under the personal influence of Berengar. Döllinger, i. (1843) 375 : Hildebrand may well have been deceived by Berengar, as he was concerned with practical questions, not dogmas. Sudendorf, p. 130 ff. (following Lessing, pp. 160, 172 ff., 175), held that Hildebrand was convinced of the truth of Berengar's teaching at Tours, but afterwards left him in the lurch, and so became a traitor to truth. Schwabe, p. 80 ff., also thinks that Hildebrand played an unworthy part at Tours. It was for him merely a question of politics, and during his mission to Tours he created the impression that he supported the Berengarians. Schnitzer, p. 56 f., criticises both Sudendorf and Schwabe, and holds that they would not have been so certain of the good impression made on Hildebrand by Berengar at Tours if they had not had Geoffrey's letter (Sudendorf, p. 215 ff.) to fall back on. But as that letter was written under Berengar's influence, the only reliable evidence lies in the *De Sacra Cœna*, and that account also is biased. Berengar assumed too much. Hildebrand would not have been so foolish as to defend him at Rome : he would not so have compromised his own career. Loofs, p. 572, thinks that Schwabe's account of the Synod of

Berengar's friends in Tours and Angers, and the Scolasticus himself complained when no improvement of his cause was marked after the legate's return to Rome, that although Hildebrand recognised the falseness of the charge of heresy brought against him, he did not repress his enemies. Even Pilate did not fear to testify to the innocence of the Lord Jesus. But after the arrival of Berengar's enemies Hildebrand had feared to meet him save in public. It was particularly noticeable that he had not excommunicated the foolish person who had called for an anathema on those who did not admit the absence of bread and wine after consecration, although Hildebrand well knew that this was contrary to sound doctrine. Hildebrand is charged with dissimulation,[1] which now confounded many learned people who were present at the Synod, and who had expected something different from the arrival of Hildebrand.[2]

Although Hildebrand's conduct was not understood in Anjou, his subsequent treatment of Berengar, and the attitude of the Curia towards the legate at the Council of Rome in 1059, show that the legate had been impressed by Berengar's teaching. It is probable that the hostility of some of the bishops at Tours convinced him that no solution favourable to Berengar could be obtained there. At Rome in 1059 Hildebrand was silent from a similar cause. Moreover, it is probable that in any case he realised that a final decision could only be reached at Rome. Having been twice condemned at a papal council

---

Tours is the best section of his book, but does not think that he has done justice to Sudendorf. Ébersolt, p. 38 f., combines the views of Gfrörer and Schnitzer. Fliche, p. 382, thinks that Hildebrand's attitude at Tours 'fut inattaquable quant à l'orthodoxie.'

We may conclude that there is little doubt that Hildebrand was impressed by Berengar's teaching, as his subsequent attitude to Berengar shows, though no evidence can be found for Hildebrand's own eucharistic belief, as Neander, vi. 320 n. 1, suggests, in the *Determinatio* of John of Paris, d. 1306 (*cf. infra*, p. 197 n. 1). But Schwabe is right in holding that politics mainly swayed the legate, and certainly his action at Tours was controlled by orders issued at Rome.

[1] Schwabe, p. 83, suggests that Hildebrand was one man before the Synod and another after it; that possibly he was deceived by the intentions of the bishops, or that by means of a double game he tried to avoid disobliging either side.

[2] Sudendorf, p. 215 ff. ('Epis. of Geoffrey to Hildebrand'). Although inspired and perhaps written by Berengar, the general truth of its statements need not be affected.

in Italy, it was unlikely that the Curia would agree to a final settlement elsewhere, and the legate may have been under orders to adjourn the case to Rome.[1] Again, as Berengar had not, so far, obeyed the papal summons to appear before its tribunal in Italy, it is difficult to see that the Curia could sanction a settlement until he had submitted. Finally, if the dispute were settled in Rome, not only might it be hoped that the eucharistic controversy would be satisfactorily laid to rest, but another stage in the submission of the French and Angevine clergy to the claims of the Papacy would be registered.

---

[1] I find that Brucker, ii. 350, takes a similar view. Hildebrand had orders to deal gently with Berengar and bring him to Rome.

CHAPTER VII

NICHOLAS II AND THE COUNCIL OF ROME (1059)

During the spring of 1054, and probably after the Synod of Tours, Berengar regained the favour of Henry I, through the intervention of Frollant, Bishop of Senlis.[1] He had apparently written to Frollant asking for his intervention with the King, who acceded to the request possibly partly because he wished to improve the good relations with Geoffrey, by a concession made to Geoffrey's protégé, partly as a boon granted to a dying man.[2] On announcing the result of his negotiation Frollant sought the intervention of Berengar before a higher tribunal.

---

[1] Frollant speaks of ' this Lent,' so that the letter was written in the spring of the year. It can hardly fall in the spring of 1050 (as Schnitzer, p. 13 n. 1, suggests), for Berengar had not then lost the royal favour ; he went to Paris in the summer of that year, with full conviction that he could secure the King's moral support for the coming Council of Vercelli. It cannot have been written in 1051 (as Bulaeus, p. 421 f., and Oudin, p. 629 f., record), or in 1052 (Gfrörer, *Kirchengesch.*, p. 509 n. 1), for Henry was not likely to consider Berengar favourably until after the peace between the King and Geoffrey of Anjou (not later than August 1052). Frollant's letter might have been written in the spring of 1053, but he was probably too ill to be able to write a letter then, for in the letter he refers to his approaching dissolution. Sudendorf, p. 25, suggests that he died in 1055. The Lent of 1054 is left open as the time when the letter was written. But we cannot be certain, for we do not read of Frollant's successor Guy until 1058 (Sudendorf, p. 24), although, of course, his election before this date is not excluded. Schnitzer meticulously criticises Sudendorf's statement that Frollant had *regained* the royal favour for Berengar, whereas Frollant says that he had gained it (' adquisivi tibi gratiam Domini mei Regis '). The absence of allusion to Berengar's teaching or to the persecution of the Archdeacon is natural in a letter written by an intimate friend, who was possibly a dying man, especially as Frollant had private requests to make of Berengar. Schwabe, p. 72, says that the letter was not addressed to Berengar.

[2] Sudendorf, p. 25, suggests that Henry was impressed by the Synod of Tours in favour of Berengar, but Frollant had secured the reconciliation in Lent, and the Synod did not meet till the end of April or beginning of May, well after Easter, which fell on April 3 in 1054.

Detained by two infirmities, I have not been able, as arranged, to come to you, but I beg you to pray for me more than ever that I may be released from this sickness which destroys my life. I know not whether I shall be able to see you again in this life, beloved Master, but take care that I shall see thee in another world in peace. But if God preserves my life long enough to give me an opportunity of seeing you, I should not lose it, but should fulfil my old desire for you by coming to you, for I dare not ask that you should come to me this Lent.[1] If I am beset by the double misfortune of not being able to come to you, and of your not being able to come to me, and if death seizes on me first, I commit my soul to you. Send on behalf of my soul pleading messages to the court of heaven. Ask the chief of the archangels and apostles, and other leaders of that court, who sit with the great King as friends, that they may deign to suggest in so far that He should command the liberation of my sinful soul from the prison of death. Yea, do you yourself, in prayer, sometimes, yea often, as you do for others, approach for me the most reverend and benign King—pray faithfully that He may deign to spare me. The Lord Abbot R.[2] . . . and his monks and brethren, whom thy love secured for me, salute in my name, and ask that they may remember me in their prayers. Whatever is pleasing to you let me know. I desire your fraternity to know that I have gained completely[3] the favour of my Lord the King for you. Farewell, and although you need no reminder, see that you pray for me.[4]

A less gratifying communication was received from Drogo of Paris. Already in 1051 Drogo had gently rebuked him, and this letter was followed by another in which he tried to prove that the teaching of Augustine did not bear out Berengar's conclusions.[5] Berengar delayed for a long time before answering, and perhaps he wrote during the period of comparative leisure between the Synod of Tours and the Council of Rome (1059).[6]

---

[1] Does this reflect Berengar's fear of leaving Angers without reconciliation with the King?

[2] Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 22, identifies 'Abbot R.' with Richard, to whom Berengar wrote asking for intercession with the King (*cf. supra*, p. 90 f.). Heurtevent, p. 151 n. 2, suggests that 'Abbot R.' may have been Reginald, Abbot of S. Peter, Bourgueil, in the diocese of Angers. He thinks that Mabillon's conjecture is inadmissible, because Berengar refers to Richard as 'frater,' whereas an Abbot is termed 'Dominus,' as in the letter of Frollant.

[3] 'Multum firmiter acquisivi tibi gratiam Domini mei Regis' (Migne, 143, 1372a).

[4] Migne, 143, 1369–1372.

[5] The letter is lost, but we learn its contents from Berengar's reply.

[6] Sudendorf, p. 215; *cf.* p. 127 f. He dates the letter about 1054 on the ground that sufficient time must be allowed after 1051, the date of

Drogo's letter, he says, created joy like the voice of the bridegroom proclaiming honest and useful things in the house of the Lord.

> I would have replied with as much care to your worship's letter as my numerous and most troublesome occupations permit, hoping with no small desire if God willed to discuss much with you, and that you should hear all that is necessary, but that I had conceived the certain hope of seeing and hearing from you, with opportunity for delay and revision, on what you wrote at the end of your letter on my ideas, if it were in any way possible. It did not seem to me to be by any means uncertain that it could be brought about in many ways, so that I might see you and hear from you at leisure, among which the easiest obviously is that you should make use of the Bishop of Chartres in the business. Concerning this I marvel, and meanwhile I must not be silent, that you seem to think in your letter that the blessed Augustine felt differently from others. Clearly I hold, and can easily satisfy every lover of truth, and I pray much that you may not escape from believing me, that in the matter of the Lord's Table, the blessed Hilary, Jerome, Ambrose and Gregory, not to mention others, undoubtedly think the same as Augustine. May He who desired to be lifted up that He might draw all things unto Himself, carry on the good beginnings in you to better endings.

Evidently the relations between Berengar and Drogo were becoming estranged, as Berengar's previous complaint showed,[1] but they had not yet reached the acute stage revealed in Gozechin's letter of about 1070, when the latter could refer to Drogo as the open enemy of Berengar.[2]

During these years the enemies of Berengar were not idle. In 1055 Maurilius, Archbishop of Rouen, held a synod of the clergy of Normandy at Rouen, and drew up a definition on the doctrine of the Eucharist, to which he required all the bishops present to swear,[3] a proceeding which shows how little impression Berengar had made on the Norman clergy at Brionne, and how little they regarded the Synod of Tours (1054) as a victory for him. The formula was drawn up

---

Drogo's second letter (Sudendorf, p. 210), for Drogo's lost letter and for Berengar's long delay in replying.

[1] *Supra*, p. 93.

[2] Migne, 143, 902a; *infra*, p. 153 f.

[3] *Vita Maurilii* (Migne, 143, 1382c f.).

with the express purpose of checking Berengar and his supporters :[1]

> We believe with the heart and confess with the mouth that the bread placed on the altar is only bread before the consecration, but through the same consecration, through the ineffable power of the Godhead, the nature and substance of bread is converted into the nature and substance of flesh ; and indeed not into the flesh of anything save that which was conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, which for us men and for our salvation was smitten with the scourge, hung upon the cross, lay in the grave, on the third day rose from the grave, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father. Similarly the wine, which, mingled with water is placed in the cup for consecration, is truly and essentially converted into that blood which, through the lance of the soldier, flowed happily from the wound in the Lord's side for the redemption of the world. We anathematise all who with proud and heretical thought chatter with impious rashness against this holy apostolic faith.[2]

Victor II was consecrated Pope on April 13, 1055, and in June of the same year he held a Council at Florence, in the presence of the Emperor Henry III, when the sentence passed on Berengar by Leo IX in 1050 was confirmed ;[3] but during Victor's short pontificate—he died July 27, 1057—Berengar was not personally cited by the Curia, nor was any action taken against him during the time of Stephen IX, August 3, 1057, to March 29, 1058.

Some modern writers have attributed an active propaganda to Berengar during the period between the Synod of Tours (1054) and the Council of Rome (1059).[1] But this conjecture must be received with caution. We do not read, at any period of his career, of definite propaganda organised by him.[2] His teaching was becoming more widely known all through his life. Naturally it was better known in the towns and villages of France[3] and Anjou than elsewhere. It spread to Normandy,[4] Belgium,[5] and Germany,[6] and by 1059, at the latest, it was known in Italy.[7] But the dissemination of the Berengarian teaching was the actual consequence of the activity of his pupils when they took up work in the parishes and monasteries of France and other parts of Europe, after leaving Tours.[8] Lanfranc alleges that Berengar's writings were circulated in this way by his disciples.[9] If they taught the Berengarian doctrine, that was because it represented the only theology which they had absorbed during their student days. Their peculiar ideas were not confined to the Eucharist. They had been trained in a new method of scriptural exegesis, which was applied especially to the Psalms, the Pauline epistles, and the Apocalypse.[10] All this gave a new tone and character to their teaching, which by its novelty created the impression of a large propaganda being at work. Again, there is no evidence that his scholars were able to effect any change in the cultus of the Mass. We read of no councils or synods drawing up decrees to check innovations in the Mass itself. The confession of Maurilius was concerned with doctrine, and seems to have been used by bishops and abbots only. The reaction against Berengar was not accompanied by popular outbursts, which would have occurred if his doctrine had caused changes in the Mass. It took the form of literary activity, proving that their teaching was confined mainly to the discussions of the learned.

---

[1] *Vita Maurilii* (Migne, 143, 1382c f.).

[2] Mabillon, *Analecta*, p. 514 ; *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 23. In the *Analecta*, Mabillon, who is followed by the older writers, places this Council in 1063. In the *Acta* he gives 1055. The point was cleared up by Bouquet, xi. 529c, quoting an anonymous writer, who says that at the time William was Duke, Henry was King, and Victor was Pope. Now, Victor was not Pope until 1055 and died in 1057 and Henry died in 1060, so that the date 1063 is impossible (*cf.* Sudendorf, p. 65 ; *Hist. Litt.*, viii. 207 ; Héfélé–Leclercq, p. 1170 n. 1 ; Mansi, xix. 841). The definition is printed by Migne, 143, 1383a f., in an account of the later Synod of Rouen of 1063, which states that the confession then made by the bishops had been drawn up by Maurilius at an earlier Council (*cf.* Schwabe, p. 111 n. 1). Ceillier, xx. 292, thinks that reports of the Councils of 1055 and 1063 at Rouen refer to the same assembly.

[3] Mansi, xix. 837. Lanfranc seems to refer to this Council. 'Sed quidquid de hac re . . . sua atque omnium conciliorum auctoritate firmavit' (Migne, 150, 413d). *Cf.* Héfélé–Leclercq, iv. pt. ii. 1170 n. 1 ; Will, ii. 31. But the Council was not held especially to deal with Berengar's case as Mabillon (*Vet. Analecta*, p. 514), Bouquet (xi. 528e), and Höfler (ii. 232) allege.

---

[1] Schnitzer, p. 58 ff.; Ébersolt, p. 42; Héfélé-Leclercq, iv. pt. ii. 1170 n. 1.

[2] The organised propaganda perceived by Reuter, i. 112 f., which included missionary journeys undertaken by Berengar and his agents, public disputations, secret embassies, and correspondence cannot be traced in the authorities.

[3] 'Epis. of Gozechin' (Migne, 143, 900b); Lanfranc (Migne, 150, 412a); Malmesbury (*G.R.*, p. 338).

[4] *Vita Maurilii* (Migne, 143, 1382c); Durand (Migne, 149, 1421d).

[5] *Infra*, p. 121, on the activity against Berengar at Liège.

[6] Lanfranc (Migne, 150, 412a); 'Epis. of Theoduin' (Migne, 146, 1439b); 'Epis. of Wolfelm' (Migne, 154, 412 ff.—written in Germany); 'Epis. of Adelmann' (Heurtevent, p. 288, but 'Teutonicas aures' may only refer to Flanders).

[7] Lanfranc (Migne, 150, 411d).

[8] 'Epis. of Gozechin' (Migne, 143, 900b); Sigebert (*Mon. Ger. SS.*, vi. 359; Migne, 160, 210b; Bouquet, xi. 164c); *Gall. Christ.*, xiv. 156a.

[9] Migne, 150, 409b.

[10] *Supra*, p. 30.

At Liège the refutation of Berengar's doctrine was carried on for many years. Adelmann wrote him from Liège.[1] Theoduin addressed Henry I from that city,[2] both letters being written by 1051. Gozechin of Mainz sent his letter to Walcher at Liège before 1070.[3] The first formal treatise against Berengar was written by Hugh, Bishop of Langres, by 1049.[4] In 1054–58 Durand, Abbot of Troarn in Normandy, wrote the first extensive work against the Scolasticus, although, as it is not mentioned in the works of Lanfranc or Berengar, probably it did not appear till many years later. This book, the *De Corpore et Sanguine Christi*, was written to check the spread of Berengar's opinions in France and Normandy.[5] It briefly traces the history of the controversy from the visit of Berengar to Ansfroi at Préaux to the Council of Paris, and closes with a passing allusion to another Council which can only be that of Tours. He lays chief emphasis on the proceedings at Brionne, Chartres, and Paris.[6] To the history of this dispute Durand's book makes a useful contribution, and its value for the history of the development of the doctrine of the Eucharist from the orthodox standpoint is second only to that of Guitmund of Aversa[7] in the eleventh century.

---

[1] *Supra*, p. 49 ff.

[2] *Supra*, p. 87 ff.

[3] *Infra*, p. 153 n. 1.

[4] *Supra*, p. 51 f.

[5] Migne, 149, 1421c–d. Sudendorf, p. 25 ff., dates the book *c.* 1058. Heurtevent, p. 103 n. 2, argues that the sudden cessation of the account of Durand after the Council of Paris (1051) suggests that the book was written before the Synod of Tours (1054), and was turned into verse 1057–58. But Durand does refer to a Council after that of Paris, at which Berengar was compelled to take an oath, and from which he retracted (Migne, 149, 1424a). This can only be the Synod of Tours (*cf.* Sudendorf, p. 26). If Durand does not refer to the Council of Rouen (1055) that was because it did not specifically deal with Berengar's case. Heurtevent suggests that the erroneous date 1053 given by Durand to the events of 1050–51 was due to the fact that when writing in 1053–54 he was distracted by recollections of the recent year 1053, a somewhat improbable conjecture. Durand makes no reference to the works of Lanfranc and Guitmund.

[6] Migne, 149, 1421–1423.

[7] *Infra*, p. 341 ff.

Whether a report of this literary activity reached Berengar is not known. He makes no reference to it in his writings, where the absence of any comment on Durand is curious. However, during the period before the Council of Rome (1059) he sent a long overdue reply to Adelmann. The letter [1] contains the earliest extensive treatment of his theory of the Eucharist which has come down to us. Freedom from persecution by the civil or ecclesiastical authorities after the Synod of Tours may well have encouraged him to begin the literary formulation of his views, and to send the first instalment of them in the form of a reply to Adelmann. Although not written in the violent terms of the *De Sacra Cœna*, the note of controversy is already struck. His antagonism fastens upon Paschasius and Lanfranc, and their supporters are described as a ' mob ' with whom Paschasius and Lanfranc ' rage,' [2] epithets which occur in the *De Sacra Cœna*.[3] The epistle closes with a pun on Adelmann's name, a literary licence which was not regarded with much offence in those days ; he calls him ' Aulusmannus '—the ' Fluteman ' or Flutist.[4]

Hildebrand's proposal for the settlement of the eucharistic dispute, which was checked by the death of Leo IX in April 1054, was put into operation again a few years later. As the case had been already tried in his absence by two papal councils, no final decision could be reached without the appearance of the defendant in Rome. Moreover, the eleventh century witnessed a growing tendency on the part of the Curia to claim final jurisdiction in all cases which could not be settled locally, especially when doctrinal or general principles of ecclesiastical administration were involved. Owing to the unsettlement of conditions in Rome, due to the short pontificates of the first two successors of Leo IX, more than four years passed away before the Berengarian dispute again became a leading question at Rome. But so soon as Nicholas II was elected (January 25, 1059), Hildebrand wrote to Berengar reminding him of the visit to Rome which had been abandoned at the death of Leo.[1]

---

[1] Fragments of Berengar's letter appear in Martène and Durand, iv. 109–113 (under the date 1078), and are printed by Schmid, pp. 34–35. Gfrörer (*Kirchengesch.*, iv. pt. i. 509 n. 1) dates the letter *c.* 1050. Sudendorf, p. 23 f., has 1050–57. We may note that the letter makes no reference to Humbert, and its pointed references to Lanfranc preclude a date after 1059, when Humbert became especially offensive to Berengar. Berengar did not become actively hostile to Lanfranc till after the Councils of Rome and Vercelli (1050). Moreover, at that time his views were not well formed as is the case in this letter. The date therefore is 1051–59 or probably 1054–59 when he was free from interference. Sudendorf does not place it later than 1057, on the ground that Adelmann's name does not appear elsewhere after that year. But the date of his death is unknown. Sigebert (Migne, 160, 582b) reports this letter.

[2] Martène and Durand, iv. 111c, 113b.

[3] *D.S.C.*, pp. 33, 53.

[4] The contents of the letter are summarised *infra*, p. 256 f.

Berengar and his friends in Anjou were encouraged by the letter of Hildebrand to expect a favourable result from the advocacy of the latter at Rome. Yet they had not forgotten Hildebrand's attitude at the Synod of Tours, and, in order to make sure, if possible, of his undivided support, Berengar either wrote or inspired a letter which Geoffrey at this time sent to Hildebrand.[2] To what extent Geoffrey held

---

[1] 'Epis. of Geoffrey to Hildebrand' (Sudendorf, p. 215): 'sicut . . . scriptis adurgebas.' There is nothing to prove that this lost letter of Hildebrand was not written before the election of Nicholas II, save the fact that Berengar appeared in Rome in April 1059. If Hildebrand's summons had been received in the time of Stephen IX, Berengar would probably again have declined to go on the death of that Pope. The delay caused by the early deaths of Victor II and Stephen IX doubtless made Hildebrand anxious to have the matter settled as early as possible in the pontificate of Nicholas II. Loofs, p. 573, doubts whether Hildebrand summoned Berengar to Rome on this occasion, because the Papacy itself was the real authority in such a case.

[2] Sudendorf, p. 215 ff. (dated March 1059; *ibid.* p. 128 ff.). There can be little doubt that Schnitzer, p. 66 n. 1, rightly attributes this letter to Berengar on the following grounds:

(*a*) Geoffrey was illiterate ('Epis. of Berengar to Geoffrey,' Sudendorf, p. 204; but it is not quite certain that Geoffrey was the addressee of this letter: *supra*, p. 94 ff), and could not have composed this letter filled with scriptural and patristic quotations.

(*b*) Many of its phrases are found in Berengar's writings: 'mensa dominica,' 'ineptorum error,' 'error ille vulgaris,' 'ille ineptus,' 'dissimulare,' 'qui panem . . . non superesse negarent.'

(*c*) Other passages resemble his language elsewhere: 'Homines invidiae atque fumo . . . caligantur' (*D.S.C.*, pp. 106, 125); 'occulte autem propter metum Judaeorum' (*D.S.C.*, p. 65); 'Qui erubuerit me et meos sermones' ('Epis. to Adelmann, Martène and Durand,' iv. 111b, and 'Epis. to Ansfroi,' Sudendorf, p. 210); 've qui tenetis clavem scientiae,' etc. ('Epis. to Ansfroi,' Sudendorf, p. 210; 'Epis. to Ascelin,' Migne, 150, 66d); 'excepto, quod Sacramentum pertinet' (*D.S.C.*, p. 274).

(*d*) On similar grounds Sudendorf, pp. 140, 196, has assigned Epistles XII and XXII to Berengar.

To these points we may add that the obscure style suggests Berengar as the writer. (We have seen that he and Renaud acted as Secretaries or Chancellors for the Count: *supra*, p. 39.) Leclercq, iv. pt. ii. 1171, the opinions of Berengar on the Eucharist is unknown, but it is improbable that the Count would allow the letter to be despatched without knowing its contents, and without maintaining at least a general approval of them.[1]

To Hildebrand, venerable son of the Roman Church, Count Geoffrey would shew himself not unworthy [2] of so great a Mother. According to your pleasure, and as you urged in your letter, Berengar comes to Rome. You must now act with Christian magnanimity, lest he feel you are the same as he found you when you came to us empowered with the apostolic authority. He then looked for your coming as that of an angel of light. Then indeed you came to give life to those who did not live, and to mortify those who lived.[3] Although you observed the falseness of the charge of heresy, which extremely evil men, reeking with the fumes of envy and pride, invented against him, you did not exert the censure of the apostolical dignity by fighting on the side of truth to the confusion of its adversaries; rather you appeared to fill the part of him who 'was a disciple of Jesus, but secretly, for fear of the Jews.' From regard for you I do not refer to him who when he had said 'I find no cause of death in Him,' did not obtain His acquittal from death by the imperial authority, although, indeed, you seem to have done even less, for Pilate did not fear to bring the Lord Jesus before him, and to bear witness to His innocence. You feared to plead for Berengar, and after his enemies had come together, you feared to meet him without a crowd, and you did not proceed to the excommunication of that fool who hurled an anathema against all who denied that the bread did not remain on the Lord's Table, although you knew that he did this with impious boldness, contrary to the truth of sound doctrine. You were quite silent, contrary to the Gospel saying 'He who is ashamed of me and my words, of him will I be ashamed in the presence of my Father,' and 'Woe to you who hold the key of knowledge, who enter not yourselves, and do not permit those who were entering,'[4] . . . indeed contrary to the prophet: 'I have not hid thy righteousness within my heart, I have declared thy faithfulness and

---

does not agree that Schnitzer has proved his case for Berengar's authorship, but he admits that the style and phraseology are his. He thinks Berengar may have inspired the letter (*ibid.* p. 1172).

[1] Schwabe, pp. 88, 119 f., maintains that Geoffrey was a staunch supporter of Berengar's views throughout his life. Schnitzer, p. 66 n. 1, *fin.*, throws out a caution. He also points out that the value of this letter as testimony to Hildebrand's assent with Berengar's teaching is lessened by our uncertainty as to Geoffrey's views. But if Berengar wrote the letter, as Schnitzer holds, then he at least had conceived a favourable impression of Hildebrand at Tours.

[2] Geoffrey would hardly have written of himself in this manner.

[3] Ezek. xiii. 19.

[4] Luke xi. 52.

thy salvation ' . . . contrary to the words ' Hear me, my people, who know my judgment, in whose heart is my law, fear ye not the reproach of men, be not overcome by their reviling, consider it not if the great spurn you, for they shall be eaten up as time consumes a garment, and as wool is eaten by the moth.' [1] But perhaps you will complain that I have allowed myself more liberty than is right against you, and you may think it was not lawful for anyone to go so far against you. I do not think that such expressions are lawful if they arise from rashness and hate. None the less, to friendship and love I would concede much more. It does not escape me, as Berengar himself also bore witness, that at that time you desired to shew yourself such deliberately and by reasonable conversation. But it must be as the blessed Augustine says in the first book of the ' City of God ' : ' If anyone spares himself from rebuking and correcting evil-doers, because he seeks a more convenient time, there is seen a counsel of charity, not an occasion of cupidity.' [2] Therefore, writing so, I should not be judged to have behaved with excess, to your injury or insult, but rather considered to have admonished a friend in a seemly manner, so that—having in view how basely your neglect can be regarded, if anyone does not perceive the reason why you neglected to rebuke those who should have been rebuked—you may estimate in fact how much effort you ought to make since you now have a convenient opportunity for your dissimulation of truth to be compensated by a free publication of the whole truth. Behold ! now is a convenient time. Behold ! now you have Berengar in the presence of the Pope. If again you pretend to the error of fools, the thing will be absolutely this—that you did not formerly reasonably defer the matter to a more convenient time, but from weakness and fear of mind you did not undertake the defence of the innocent. If the matter turns out so, and may it not be so, it will be clear that we indeed shall have fallen from the great hope we had of thee, and that you have committed no small sin against yourself, not to mention God. You will be judged as a most perverse man, coming like the rising sun,[3] yet you will be clearly known, having failed to illuminate our darkness, rather to have made our light completely dark, so far as you could do so. All who were eminent among us for learning, who weighed the matter according to the Scriptures, so far as I am informed, bore witness that Berengar held the right opinions on the Scriptures. All looked with the greatest hope to your authority for stating and, as it were, being on the point of publicly proclaiming the truth. We learned by the actual event that they were miserably confused in their expectation, by your dissimulation in the matter, and when you came to us, you shut up in silence, as it were, the open mouths of those almost on the point of proclaiming the truth. What more! I hear that those who clearly are ashamed of Christ and His words, so overcame their fear when you were with us, as to say that the business was not to enquire concerning the body and blood of Christ, but how a Christian should live.[1] Then indeed you yourself informed the Abbot of S. Aubin's that great pains must be taken to understand the point, because it was contrary to the fundamentals of Christianity to leave the mob in its error. The thing is estimated very differently[2] by those who weigh it with an equal balance, who hold not their own, but the things which are of Christ, and who say that Augustine derided this idolatry in the fourth book of the 'City of God,'[3] where he says 'A noble religion in which the weak man takes refuge to be set free! And when he seeks the truth by which to be liberated, it is believed to be expedient that he is deceived!' Meanwhile that popular error becomes a capital heresy, if by chance it grows. The resurrection of the flesh which was first effected in Christ, and concerning which the apostle says: 'This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality,' cannot be maintained, if we grant that the body of Christ, save what concerns the Sacrament, is materially broken by the hands and crushed by the teeth of the priest. You boasted and, as it were, opened the contest by saying that your Rome was never conquered either in belief or in war. You will be seen to detract from your own claim, if at this time in which God wishes you to be pre-eminent over others at the apostolical see, through your dissimulation, and the silence of papal dilatoriness, that error, which is the most certain nursery of heresy, gains strength. Take care not to hand over your honour to another, which indeed you will do if another fights on the side of truth while you thrust yourself into the hiding-place of a base silence. Lest this may happen you must weigh in your heart the saying of the apostle Paul: 'Let us go to Him without the camp, bearing His reproach,'[4] and that saying which you have often rolled in your mouth: 'Blessed are they who search out His testimonies, and seek Him with the whole heart,'[5] or 'His covenant is that He may be manifested in them.'[1] Others bequeath by a testament gold, silver goods; 'I,' saith our Lord, as He first said concerning it, 'will love him and manifest myself to him.'

---

[1] Isaiah li. 7–8. [2] Bk. I, cap. 8. Hoffmann, *C.S.E.L.*, 40, pt. i. 16.

[3] Sudendorf, p. 217 : ' oriens ad occidentalem nostrum.' The reference to light and darkness shows that the writer had in mind the transit of the sun from east to west at dawn.

---

[1] Sudendorf, p. 218 n. 19, suggests an emendation of the text so that it would read 'not to enquire how a Christian should live, but what he should believe concerning,' etc. *Cf. ibid.* p. 131.

[2] The letter is very obscure here. The contrast appears to be with the opinion of those who were ashamed of Christ, not with the opinion expressed by Hildebrand. Delarc, *Rev. Quest. Hist.*, xl. 375–377, omits this section in his translation of the letter.

[3] Hoffmann, *C.S.E.L.*, 40, pt. i. 198: 'Praeclara religio, quo confugiat liberandus infirmus, et cum veritatem qua liberetur inquirat, credatur ei expedire quod fallitur' (*De Civ. Dei*, iv. 27).

[4] Heb. xiii. 13.

[5] Ps. cxix. 2.

Schwabe refers to this letter as a proof that at Angers, in spite of Hildebrand's attitude in 1054, they had not lost confidence in Berengar.[2] But it is obvious that the letter reveals considerable hesitation in the mind of Berengar concerning the support he might expect from Hildebrand at Rome. If he was hopeful of a successful issue of the case, he relied for the time being rather upon the effect of Geoffrey's advocacy upon Hildebrand[3] than upon any conviction existing in the mind of the latter which was favourable to his interests. At the same time the letter does not preclude the possibility that Berengar had received the impression that privately Hildebrand was convinced by his views. It is also possible that, following the custom of the times, Berengar had sent gifts to people at Rome who had promised him support.[4] But his confidence must have been chiefly grounded upon a conviction of the righteousness of his cause, and sustained by this he travelled willingly to Rome.[5]

It was the Easter Council of 1059 (April). One hundred and thirteen bishops assembled for the general business of the Church.[6] Among the leading personalities we find Humbert,

---

[1] Ps. xxv. 14.

[2] P. 88 ff.; *cf.* 82 ff. He does not associate the letter with Berengar's authorship.

[3] *Cf.* Schnitzer, p. 68. Schwabe, p. 119, thinks that Berengar counted Hildebrand as a thoroughgoing supporter.

[4] Lanfranc (Migne, 150, 411d): 'fretus iis qui plus impensis a te beneficiis quam ratione a te audita opem tibi promiserant.' Lanfranc does not charge him with bribery. Berengar made no denial of the allegation. Schwabe, p. 89 f., agrees with Lanfranc. De Roye, p. 62, is doubtful.

[5] *D.S.C.*, p. 72.

[6] *Cf.* Mansi, xix. 897; *D.S.C.*, pp. 25 f., 32 f., 60 ff., 71 ff.; Lanfranc (Migne, 150, 409b–c, 410d, 411a, d, 415a–b; followed by Milo, *ibid.* 36c f.); Bernold, *De Ber. Haer. Damn. Multiplici* (Migne, 148, 1455 f.); *Chronicon* under 1060 (*Mon. Ger. SS.*, v. 427); Guitmund (Hurter, xxxviii. 164 f.); *Chron. Andegav.* (Martène and Durand, iii. 1381c; Bouquet, xi. 169d); *Anon. Mellicensis* (Migne, 213, 979a); *Chron. Sithiensis* (Bouquet, xi. 382a); *Chron. Turon.* (Bouquet, xii. 461c); *Chron. S. Bertini* (Martène and Durand, iii. 578a); Sigebert (Migne, 160, 583a: he gives 93 bishops); Mabillon, *Annales*, iv. 585; *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 24; *Vet. Analecta*, p. 515; Lessing, p. 159 ff.; Städlin, ii. 48 ff.; *Hist. Litt.*, viii. 207; Neander, vi. 322 f.; Gfrörer, *Greg. VII*, i. 601; Höfler, ii. 312 ff.; Will, ii. 173 ff.; Delarc, xl. 373 ff.; Sudendorf, p. 137 f.;

Hildebrand, and Lanfranc. The two latter took no part in the proceedings which has been recorded. Lanfranc had come in order to secure the removal of the interdict in Normandy. Duke William had ignored the papal prohibition against his wedding with Matilda of Flanders, and 'since he had married the girl'[1] was unwilling to put her away. Lanfranc, as the Duke's ambassador, represented a power standing at that time under the disapproval of the Curia. It was not therefore probable that he would be cited to speak at the session which examined Berengar. It is possible to see in this circumstance the hand of Hildebrand. The Cardinal-Archdeacon was a friend of Berengar, and he was not an uncritical admirer of Lanfranc. Berengar had come to Rome at his invitation, and he was anxious to secure a settlement as favourable as possible to the Scolasticus.[2] Prudent statesmanship therefore demanded that Lanfranc should not be called upon to intervene in Berengar's affair.[3]

Schwabe, p. 88 ff.; Schnitzer, p. 65 ff.; Ébersolt, p. 137 ff.; Héfélé–Leclercq, iv. pt. ii. 1139 ff.

The Council did not meet especially to deal with Berengar's case.

[1] Milo Crispin (Migne, 150, 37b). Cf. *Chron. Bec.* (Migne, 150, 645a).

[2] Schwabe, p. 88, thinks that Hildebrand did not desire a settlement on Berengar's terms, but still less did he want the discussion to go against him. *Cf.* Loofs, p. 573. On Berengar and Hildebrand *cf.* Reuter, i. 121 ff.

[3] Lanfranc's visit to Rome in 1059 is recorded by Milo, his biographer Migne, 150, 37a), whose account is followed by the *Chron. Bec.* (Migne, 150, 645a), another twelfth-century compilation (*cf.* Porée, *Chronique du Bec*, 1883, Introd. xxi). Milo's account was derived from Lanfranc's. Lanfranc's presence at Rome is mentioned by an old Chronicler reported by Bouquet (xi. 430c). Confirmation is found in Henry of Knighton's fabulous story (*Rolls*, i. 89 f.). Lanfranc had shut himself up in the cloister at Bec. Berengar thought he was dead, and succeeded in spreading his error so widely that he converted Nicholas II. The Pope called a Council. Herluin, Abbot of Bec, attended, and only granted Lanfranc permission to attend after urgent persuasion. When no one could confute Berengar at the Council, Lanfranc after much delay obtained permission from Herluin to speak, and brilliantly defeated Berengar, who said: 'You are either Lanfranc or the devil.' Lanfranc replied: 'I am Lanfranc, and you are a heretic, and when we disputed in the schools, you always collected authorities against the Catholic Church.' Schwabe, p. 93 n. 1, and Schnitzer, p. 69 n. 4, deny Lanfranc's presence, alleging that Berengar reports his absence: 'Manu, quod mendaciter at te pervenit' (*D.S.C.*, p. 25). We may add that this statement is confirmed by another: 'Ego longe verius te, quid cum Nicholao egerim, novi' (*ibid.* p. 72). But they do not prove conclusively Lanfranc's absence, which Berengar would definitely have reported, as he loses no opportunity of discrediting the details in Lanfranc's report. On the other hand, if Lanfranc does not say clearly that he was there, that may

If Berengar counted upon the open support of Hildebrand he was grievously disappointed. But in his embittered account of the proceedings we do not find a word of reproach against the Cardinal-Archdeacon. Possibly he perceived that the affair had been taken completely out of Hildebrand's hands, and that the latter was under the suspicion of being friendly towards him. All the accounts show that the Curia was determined to bring the Scolasticus to absolute submission. Berengar was not allowed to defend himself.[1] When he attempted to explain his views, the assembly stopped its ears at the mention of the word 'spiritual,'[2] and declined to permit him to explain what he meant by a spiritual interpretation of the change of the elements in the Sacrament.[3] Amid the rapidly growing excitement he made an emotional appeal to the Pope, asking why he should be exposed to beasts and untamed spirits, and urged Nicholas to hear him with Christian sympathy and fatherly care, or, if that were not possible, to appoint a committee to examine his writings. He reminded the Pontiff that he had come willingly to Rome,[4] and pleaded that he ought not to be hastily condemned, but patiently heard, admonition being given if necessary. The Pope referred him to Hildebrand [5]—a sarcastic gesture aimed at Hildebrand as well as Berengar. Steps had been taken to prevent Hildebrand from influencing the course of the proceedings,[6] and a papal advocate was put forward, whose orthodoxy was zealous and unimpeachable, and whose hostility to the Scolasticus was more implacable than that of Lanfranc.

---

have been due to reticence occasioned by the fact that he was not allowed a share in the proceedings against Berengar. The vagueness of both reports suggests this solution.

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 73 : 'nec mihi respondendi licentiam fecit.' *Cf.* pp. 25, 33. Lanfranc (Migne, 150, 415c) says that Berengar received permission to speak from the Pope, but declined to use the opportunity.

[2] *D.S.C.*, p. 63 : 'Spiritualitatis nomen in refectione mensae dominicae nec audire potuisse'; p. 72 : 'ad vocem spiritualitatis aures potius obturabant.'

[3] *Ibid.* p. 72 : 'qui nec audire poterant spiritualem de corpore Christi refectionem.'

[4] *Ibid.* p. 72 : 'Romam tanto contendissem labore ultroneus.' Gfrörer, *Greg. VII*, i. 601, says that he went to Rome with a heavy heart.

[5] *D.S.C.*, p. 73.

[6] The *Rev. Bénédictine*, vi. (1889) 56, suggests that Hildebrand hoped by lenient treatment to win back Berengar.

With the intervention of Humbert, the Bishop of Silva Candida, an ecclesiastic whose influence at the Curia threatened to overshadow that of the great Archdeacon, the affair of Berengar was quickly brought to a close. Humbert drew up a confession of belief, expressing the doctrine of the Eucharist, but couched in terms which never appeared in any later official definition of the doctrine. This was placed in Berengar's hands.[1] The assembly stood hostile and threatening, and he realised that death would be the penalty of a refusal to submit.[2] He did not dare to speak again, but in silence fell on the ground [3] and read the document aloud : [4]

> I Berengar, the unworthy deacon of the Church of S. Maurice, Angers, perceiving the true Catholic and Apostolic Faith, anathematize all heresy, especially that of which up to this point I am publicly accused, which attempts to maintain that the bread and wine placed on the altar, after consecration are only a sacrament, and not the true body and true blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and cannot in the sacrament only, be perceptibly [5] touched or broken by the hands of the priest, or ground by the teeth of the faithful. Moreover I agree with the holy Roman and Apostolic See, and with mouth and heart I profess to hold that belief in the Sacrament of the Lord's Table, which the Lord and venerable Pope Nicholas and this holy Synod, by evangelical and apostolical authority delivered and confirmed to me ; namely that the bread and wine which are placed on the altar, after consecration are not only a sacrament, but the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and perceptibly [5] not only in the Sacrament, but in reality,[6] are

---

[1] Lanfranc (Migne, 411d, 415a).

[2] Héfélé–Leclercq, iv. pt. ii. 1177, deny that they sought Berengar's life at Rome. Schnitzer, p. 73 n. 3 : they sought his conversion, but in the event of refusal would have handed him over to death.

[3] *D.S.C.*, p. 73 : 'quia comminatione mortis, et forensibus etiam litibus indignissima mecum agebatur tumultuaria perturbatione usquequaque obmutui.' I have given the punctuation suggested by Schwabe (p. 89 n. 6). Cf. *D.S.C.*, p. 61 : 'quod iam imminentis terrore mortis perturbatus.' Berengar's statement is confirmed by Lanfranc, who says it would have been better for him to finish his life by an honest death (Migne, 150, 414d : 'vitam honesta morte finire') than to commit perjury.

[4] Lanfranc (Migne, 150, 411d ; *cf.* Milo, p. 36c) alleges that Berengar asked for this statement to be handed to him. Berengar denies this (*D.S.C.*, p. 72). Schwabe, p. 93, writes too strongly when he says that Lanfranc's account of the oath was a spiteful invention. The fact that Berengar read the oath was equivalent to swearing it, in Lanfranc's estimation. On the other hand, because he did this under compulsion Berengar was justified in maintaining that he had not conscientiously sworn.

[5] 'sensualiter.'

[6] 'in veritate.'

touched and broken by the hands of the priest and ground by the teeth of the faithful. I swear by the holy and consubstantial [1] Trinity and through this holy Gospel of Christ. Those who proceed against this faith with their documents and followers [2] I pronounce to be worthy of eternal anathema. If I myself at any time presume to hold or preach anything contrary to this, I will submit to the severity of the Canons. Having read and read again, I have willingly subscribed to this.[3]

Berengar was not called upon to sign this confession, nor was he asked to make any statement of consent to it, apart from reading its contents.[4] The terminology of the confession was humiliating enough, but he was compelled to kindle a fire and to cast certain writings into it in the presence of the Council.[5] If some of Berengar's own writings were condemned, as Lanfranc says, no doubt he was compelled to include them in the destruction.[6]

Although one other painful surprise and humiliation awaited Berengar at a Roman Council, he was not again compelled to swear to a confession so grossly material, and so devoid of spiritual insight and evangelical feeling as this terrible statement.[7] Later events showed that it was the work of the uncompromising Humbert,[8] especially the milder treatment meted out to Berengar after his death in 1061,[9] but for the time being the Curia and its supporters rejoiced in their victory over the humiliated Scolasticus. It was regarded not only as a triumphant vindication of papal authority,[1] but as the conversion of a famous heretic. 'Rejoicing in thy conversion,' writes Lanfranc, 'Pope Nicholas sent thy written oath to all the cities of Italy, France, and Germany, and wherever the report of thy depravity had reached.[2] As the scandalized churches had before sorrowed over thy falling away from truth, so now they rejoiced and gave thanks to God for your return and conversion.'[3] That the Curia sent far and wide the news of Berengar's submission need not be questioned, but how far it was from being justified in its conviction that the controversy had ended, and that Berengar had been won over, the sequel will show.

---

[1] 'homousion.' [2] 'dogmatibus et sectatoribus.'

[3] Lanfranc (Migne, 150, 410d–411a); Bernold (Migne, 148, 1455a ff.).

[4] *D.S.C.*, p. 25: 'Manu, quod mendaciter ad te pervenit, non subscripsi, nam ut de consensu pronunciarem meo, nullus exegit.' Lanfranc (Migne, 150, 411d) alleged that he signed it with his own hand. Schnitzer, p. 74 n. 1, dismisses Berengar's statement as mere sophistry. Schwabe, pp. 71–93, equally strongly rejects Lanfranc's account. Loofs, p. 573, criticises some points in Schwabe's account.

[5] Lanfranc (Migne, 150, 409b): 'ignem accendisti, librosque perversi dogmatis . . . in eum conjecisti.' Bernold develops this statement and says that Berengar destroyed his own works, *De Ber. Haer. Damn.* (Migne, 148, 1455b); *Chron.* (*Mon. Ger. SS.*, v. 439, and Migne, 148, 1383a). Berengar (p. 61) says that he burned 'prophetica, evangelica et apostolica scripta.' Schwabe (p. 91) suggests that he was compelled to burn the works of John the Scot (although Loofs, p. 573, questions the suggestion). Berengar regarded the writings of John the Scot as having scriptural support.

[6] Migne, 150, 409b.

[7] Many Catholic writers admit the grossness of Humbert's formula. *Cf.* Delarc, xl. 380 n.; Batiffol (ed. 1905), p. 380; H. K. Mann, *Lives of the Popes*, vi. (1910) 240.

[8] Schwabe, p. 89. Nicholas II, a new Pope, was in the hands of his advisers.

[9] May 5, 1061 (Halfmann, p. 21).

---

[1] Loofs, p. 573, questions whether the right of the Curia to settle dogmatic questions was recognised at this date.

[2] Gfrörer, *Greg. VII*, i. 603, sees in Berengar's presence at Rome a sign that Henry I of France now supported the Papacy against the Emperor Henry IV. He also suggests that if the supporters of Hildebrand had not so definitely opposed the Emperor, Berengar's teaching might have caused Protestant churches to spring up in Europe. With Berengar's refutation the contest lost its political character and became a mere academic question.

[3] Migne, 150, 411d f. Cf. *D.S.C.*, p. 25.

CHAPTER VIII

CHANGES IN ANJOU AND ROME

Under great dejection of mind Berengar returned from Rome to Anjou. The oath which had been extracted from him by threats did not trouble him,[1] but his conscience could not rest under the recollection of having thrown into the fire the writings of those whom he admired. This was an entirely consistent attitude. Only he who felt that he had missed the crown of martyrdom could regret the oath, and Berengar never craved for distinction of that kind. He quite properly complained of the valuelessness of an oath obtained under fear of death. But the surrender of writings of those who had enlightened his own mind, and inspired him to stand out against the massed opinions of the orthodox churchmen of the day, even though also done under compulsion, was an act which a less sensitive mind might well look back upon with regret and shame. 'I confess my wickedness to the Lord, that he may forgive the impiety of my sin.' . . . 'I am an unhappy man, most wretched in mind . . . not because I was a heretic, but because under the fear of death I did not assert the truth, but at the orders of the mob, cast prophetic, evangelic, and apostolic writings into the fire.'[2]

However, no public demonstration was made for the time being by Berengar. In the following year (1060) a papal legate, Cardinal Stephen, held a synod at Angers.[3] The acts of the Synod were directed against simony, lay investiture, the tenure of clerical offices in more than one town,[4] clerical marriage, military service by the clergy, the acquisition of church property by the laity, and against marriages within the prohibited degrees, as well as against adultery and divorce.[1] There is no reference to the case of Berengar; and Eusebius, the Bishop of Angers, does not mention this synod in the list of provincial councils which dealt with the eucharistic question,[2] so that we may conclude that no public statement had been made by Berengar on the decision of the Council of Rome. But he did not remain inactive for long.

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 60.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 61.

[3] Probably also at Tours on March 1 (*cf. infra*, p. 143 n. 10).

[4] Schnitzer, p. 8 n. 5, says that this canon did not become effective in practice. De Roye, p. 21, alleges that Berengar gave up his offices at Tours after becoming Archdeacon of Angers. The evidence is against this, although the plurality in Berengar's case may have influenced the Synod to pass the decree. Pletteau, p. 39, dates this Synod 1061.

We have seen that already, some ten years earlier, he had attacked Pope Leo IX, and the findings of the Councils of Rome and Vercelli (1050), in a pamphlet which Paulinus of Metz appears to have seen, but which has been lost.[3] Soon after his return from Rome in 1059 he wrote another and probably longer attack upon the decision of the Roman Council of that year. The chief points in this publication, which has also been lost or destroyed,[4] are summarised, verbatim, in Lanfranc's reply, the *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*.[5]

---

[1] D'Achery quotes the canons in full (Migne, 150, 64 f.).

[2] 'Epis. of Eusebius to Berengar' (de Roye, p. 48 f.). *Cf.* Schwabe, p. 95 n. 3.

[3] *Supra*, p. 93.

[4] That the destruction of Berengar's writings went on during his lifetime is proved by Lanfranc's statement (Migne, 150, 415b): 'Id quoque in hoc opusculo, quod destruendum suscepi.' Sigebert, who died in 1112 (*De Script. Eccles.*, Migne, 160, 582c), says that he defended his doctrine in many writings and letters.

[5] Migne, 150, 409–426. The passages are gathered together in the Vischers' edition of Berengar's *De Sacra Cœna*, pp. 8–11.

In my *Lanfranc*, p. 51 n. 1(*b*), I have quite wrongly dated this pamphlet before 1059. Lanfranc states clearly that in the pamphlet Berengar went back upon his submission at Rome (1059) (Migne, 150, 409c), and in the pamphlet Berengar refers to the oath submitted to him by Humbert on that occasion (Migne, 150, 409d), and quotes part of it (*ibid.* 410c). So the tract appeared after the spring of 1059. In 1062 Geoffrey Barbatus began to molest him, and for some years he had little leisure of mind. But there was a quiet interval between the summer of 1059 and 1062, and during this period his pamphlet was probably written.

Schwabe, p. 93, quoting Berengar's statement (*D.S.C.*, p. 25), 'quae illud cum reverencia scriptum susceperunt,' which refers to the oath of 1059, circulated by Nicholas II, says that Berengar's pamphlet was written in reply to this, possibly before the death of Count Geoffrey (p. 95), or more probably afterwards (p. 109). He published it widely (p. 94). Lessing, p. 53 f., dates it after the death of Nicholas II and Humbert, but not before 1063, and his reasons impressed Schwabe (p. 95). Lessing, p. 65 f., finally decides for 1063–69, and is followed by Sudendorf, p. 40. Schnitzer, p. 84, thinks that Berengar would not have attacked Nicholas and Humbert during their lifetime. But it must be noticed that Berengar attacked Gregory VII after the Roman Council of 1079, probably before

The pamphlet appears to have contained an attack on Lanfranc, but was mainly directed against Cardinal Humbert, whom he calls the Burgundian.[1] The oath which they made him swear at Rome was contrary to the Catholic faith, and expressed the error of ' the foolish Burgundian ' who drew it up.[2] But may he, like Goliath, perish by his own sword.[3] Lanfranc is only mentioned once in the fragments preserved by the latter, in the passage in which Berengar compared the opinion of Humbert, that the bread and wine do not remain on the altar after consecration, with the folly of the mob and of Paschasius and Lanfranc.[4] Humbert claimed that his view was that of the holy Roman Church, but that Church did not understand truth, it was a Church of malignants, a Council of vanity, not apostolic, but a chair of Satan.[5] This pamphlet Berengar circulated through his disciples.[6]

On November 14, 1060, Geoffrey Martel, Count of Anjou, died,[7] and his territories were divided between his nephews, Geoffrey Barbatus and Fulk Rechin.[8] By this event Berengar found his most powerful supporter supplanted by one who

---

the death of that Pontiff in 1085. In 1085 Berengar was in seclusion at Cômes, leading the life of a reconciled and orthodox member of the Church. While rightly pointing out that the times were too stormy during 1063–68 for Berengar to have written his pamphlet, Schnitzer places it after that era, not later than 1068–69, because Lanfranc's reply, the *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, appeared in 1069 according to Schnitzer (p. 86). But this hardly leaves time enough for the writing and circulation of the pamphlet as reported by Lanfranc (Migne, 150, 409c). Ébersolt, p. 143, follows Schnitzer's date, 1068–69.

[1] Migne, 150, 409d, 412c, 412d, 418d, 426a.

[2] *Ibid.* 409d.

[3] *Ibid.* 412c.

[4] *Ibid.* 412d.

[5] *Ibid.* 426a.

[6] *Ibid.* 409b. The pamphlet is mentioned by Sigebert (Migne, 160, 583a). A monk of Beauvais, transcribing Sigebert's *Chronica*, *c.* 1138–47, added after Sigebert's entry for 1051 a statement saying that Guy, Abbot of Lefroy, wrote a book against Berengar called *De Corpore et Sanguine Christi* (*Mon. Ger. SS.*, vi. 461, but *cf. ibid.* xxiii. 789, while the interpellator of the *Chronicon* of Alberic of the Three Fountains says that Hélinand made the addition in the second half of the twelfth century). He probably refers to the work of Guitmund, also a monk of Lefroy. *Cf.* the statement of Hélinand (Migne, 212, 946c), which is taken almost verbatim from William of Malmesbury, *G.R.*, p. 338.

[7] Halphen, p. 12.

[8] Sudendorf, p. 169 f., and other writers have confused the part played by Geoffrey and Fulk during the next decade. Geoffrey, not Fulk, predominates over events until his imprisonment by Fulk in 1068. *Cf.* Bishop, p. 275 ; Schwabe, p. 95 ff. ; Halphen, p. 133 f. Sudendorf, p. 142, who emphasises the part played by Fulk, was misled by the later editions of the *Gesta Consulum Andegavensium*. The older editions show that Geoffrey Barbatus was the principal heir of Geoffrey Martel.

became a most bitter enemy. Count Geoffrey Barbatus had not long inherited the major part of his uncle's domain, before he began to show the greatest hostility to Berengar.[1]

On April 4, 1062,[2] the Abbey of S. Saviour at Angers was consecrated by Hugh, Archbishop of Besançon. Among the clergy present were Eusebius Bruno, Bishop of Angers, Bougrin, Bishop of Le Mans, and Quiriacus II, Bishop of Nantes.[3] On this occasion the opportunity was taken to convene, in the chapel of Countess Hildegarde,[4] the wife of Geoffrey Martel, a Council which dealt with the affair of Berengar. The Scolasticus was present, and another canon of S. Martin's named Geoffrey.[5] Why the Council was called we are not told, although there is a hint that the teaching of Berengar was spreading.[6] It has been conjectured that it was assembled by Count Geoffrey Barbatus, and it is feasible that the new Count was anxious to have this troublesome affair settled in his dominions, and under his supervision, at the earliest opportunity. He attended the Council, and by his orders a formula was drawn up by Eusebius Bruno, to which all present, including Berengar, gave assent.[7] If the letter of Eusebius contains its substance, a compromise had been reached which Berengar could whole-heartedly accept. The words of institution were accepted as the basis of eucharistic doctrine. No attempt was made to explain the process of the mystery, although a material interpretation was expressly condemned. The ancient appeal to the almighty creative power of God was sustained, and an analogy was drawn from the spiritual process of the Incarnation and Resurrection, which were stated to be supernatural. At the same time the mystical effectiveness of the words of institution—related to the Divine Word—when used by the priest, was upheld.

---

[1] Schnitzer, p. 75 n. 1, says that Fulk did not share in his brother's enmity to Berengar at this time. *Cf. infra*, p. 199.

[2] *Chron. Andegavense* (Bouquet, xi. 30a).

[3] *Ibid.*, and Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 26.

[4] Pletteau, p. 40, names it S. Laud.

[5] 'Epis. of Berengar to Eusebius' (Sudendorf, p. 219); *infra*, p. 137. He is also mentioned in the 'Epis. of Eusebius to Berengar' (de Roye, p. 48). The date of the Council was fixed by Sudendorf (p. 140 ff.) on the ground that Berengar and Eusebius mention the presence of the three bishops who were also at the dedication of S. Saviour's. *Cf.* Schwabe, p. 99 f. But Sudendorf wrongly places these events in the time of Count Fulk.

[6] 'Epis. of Eusebius to Berengar' (de Roye, p. 51): 'rediviva pestis . . . caput extulerat.'

[7] 'Epis. of Berengar' (Sudendorf, p. 220); 'Epis. of Eusebius' (de Roye, p. 51). *Cf.* Schwabe, p. 99 f. Mabillon (*Vet. Analecta*, p. 514) and Bouquet, xi. 529e, say that the Council was convened by Count Fulk. Bouquet refers to the *Chron. Andegavense*. But although this source mentions the Council (*ibid.* 30a), it does not say that Fulk convened it. Schnitzer, p. 75, says that Geoffrey Barbatus assembled it. Sudendorf, p. 142, is uncertain. But the statement of Eusebius, 'hac veridica confessione exactioni hujus principis nostri' (de Roye, p. 51), supports the view of Schnitzer.

However, this local settlement of the dispute was soon upset by Geoffrey, a canon of S. Martin's,[1] who had been present at the Council. The facts are made known in the letter of Berengar to Eusebius Bruno :

> To Eusebius,[2] the reverend Lord Bishop of Angers, Berengar sends all humble and devout greetings as to a father. It has reached me through those who declare they have heard it that Geoffrey of S. Martin's has made a great stir in support of the mad and foolish Lanfranc, contrary to evangelical and apostolical truth, which is so clear and firm to him who loves truth rather than darkness, to him who does not choose himself to be darkness rather than light so that the darkness does not understand the light, to him who trembles everywhere to say to his God 'Depart from me, we will not know thy ways'—truth which is as certain as that two and two make four. He has spoken contrary to that public pronouncement of your Lordship's dignity and authority, which faithfully written down and committed to memory I can quote, and which he himself heard in the chapel of the Countess Hildegarde, when Hugh, the Lord Archbishop of Besançon, was present with his clerks, together with you and the Bishop of Le Mans and the clergy of Angers and Le Mans, whose names I did not delay to memorise immediately. Let him look to it why he makes this great stir. I beg and pray you in the name of Christ, by the fear of Christ, by the love of Christ, that as father and lord, so far as the dignity of your paternity and lordship will allow and grant to me, that you will check him in this rashness, or order him and me to debate before judges the book of the blessed Ambrose on the Sacraments,[3]

---

[1] His identity is discussed by Sudendorf, p. 144.

[2] Sudendorf, p. 219 f. The initial in the MS. is F. Sudendorf corrects this to E. (*ibid.* p. 140).

[3] The so-called pseudo-Ambrosian work. That a supporter of Lanfranc against Berengar should criticise a work believed to be Ambrose's reveals the indifferent knowledge of patristics possessed by the rank and file of the clergy of the day. On the other hand, the protagonists in the dispute had a very fair knowledge of the western Fathers. Of course it is possible that Berengar regarded the use made of Ambrose by Geoffrey as discreditable to both Ambrose and the Scriptures, and that no deliberate criticism of Ambrose occurred in Geoffrey's exegesis.

for he does not cease with all his power to urge with impious rashness that that blessed soul was opposed to the gospel and the apostle, to the light of the gospel and the apostle, Himself the clear truth of inmost eternity itself.[1]

Irritated by this indication that Berengar was not satisfied with the settlement reached at Angers, and perhaps anxious to avoid giving offence to Geoffrey Barbatus[2] by appearing to sanction renewed activity on the part of Berengar, Eusebius replied with a peremptory refusal to meet the Archdeacon's wishes. The letter begins affectionately,[3] but proceeds with reserve. Eusebius does not know whether this question, which had disturbed the whole world far and near, had arisen from a desire to assert truth or to seek fame. However, he will not answer the question himself, but turns to the aid of those who were more learned and better than he, especially as offence ought not to be given to dignified and learned people. Passing over 'the little streams of turbulent disputation to the very fountain of truth,' he remarks that

---

[1] *Cf. infra*, p. 140 n. 1, for the date of the letter.

[2] Semisch, pp. 152–160, regards Eusebius' reply as an indication of a changed attitude to Berengar. This was due to the death of Geoffrey Martel and the accession of his nephews, both sworn enemies of Berengar (p. 153). But Eusebius acted cautiously and with a double mind (p. 154), of which the formula drawn up at Angers is an illustration (p. 155). In his reply to Berengar he seized the opportunity to re-establish his reputation as an orthodox churchman (p. 157 f.). Hierarchical interests stood higher with him than dogma (p. 154).

This estimate of Eusebius' policy was developed by Schwabe, p. 99 f., who attributed political motives to Eusebius. At the Synod of Angers, at the urgent request of Geoffrey Barbatus, Eusebius expressed himself in agreement with Berengar, but when the Count turned against Berengar, Eusebius probably did the same.

This view of the conduct of Eusebius is entirely disputed by Bröcking. In a literary contest with Schnitzer the former contended that Eusebius did not change his attitude to Berengar until after the Roman Council of 1079, and then only because of Berengar's persistent wrong-headedness. Eusebius was quite justified in maintaining the official view, which had been so often repeated. Halphen, p. 138 n. 1, is convinced by Bröcking. But Bröcking has been led away by a single sentence in the letter of Eusebius to Berengar (*cf. infra*, p. 141 n.). Schwabe, in this instance, allows himself to be too completely dominated by his theory of the influence of Angevine politics on the eucharistic controversy. The truth is that Berengar was becoming a nuisance to his friends, and, as is stated above, Eusebius was also annoyed by the apparent refusal of Berengar to abide by the compromise arranged at the Synod of Angers. The later hostility of Eusebius to Geoffrey Barbatus (*infra*, p. 150) shows that he was not so completely bound up with politics as Semisch and Schwabe maintained. *Cf. infra*, p. 140 n. 1, for Bröcking's argument and my criticism. On Eusebius *cf.* also Pletteau (*Rev. hist. litt. et archéol. de l'Anjou*, 1874, t. 13).

[3] 'Fratri et sincerae dilectionis cultu amplectendo consacerdoti.'

> on the day before the Lord suffered, He took bread in His holy and sacred hands, and raising His eyes to heaven, He blessed, brake and gave it to His disciples, saying, 'Take ye all and eat of this. For this is indeed my body.' In the same manner taking the glorious cup, He gave thanks, blessed it and gave it to His disciples, saying, 'Take and drink ye all of this. This is indeed the cup of my blood of the new and everlasting Testament, a mystery of faith which for you and for many is poured out in remission of sins. As often as ye do this, ye will do it in remembrance of me.' By the power and agency of His word, through which all things were made, we confess and believe that the bread after consecration, hallowed by the priest using these words, and the wine in the same way, are the true body and true blood of Christ. If any one ask how it can be done, we reply, not in a material way,[1] but through the omnipotence of God; whatever God wants to do in earth, in the sea, and in all depths, He does. Not according to the material order was God the Word in the beginning with God, conceived by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and no abundance of words can say how, or how after the Resurrection, the true body of the Lord Jesus passed through closed doors to the disciples, and could be touched. But we must firmly and faithfully believe that it was done by the almighty power of God. But if anyone asks how the Fathers and Doctors have treated these points or what writings they have left, we direct him to their books, that . . . he may select . . . what corresponds with evangelical truth. We do not despise the Fathers, but we do not read them with the same confidence as the Gospels. . . . We fear to give offence to the Church, in view of the condemnation of Christ Who said that it were better that a millstone should be cast round a man's neck than that he should offend one of Christ's little ones. We ought to be satisfied with the simple meaning of Christ's holy words. In this sense was the dispute which arose at Tours settled in the presence of the imprisoned Bishop Gervase;[2] in this sense was the tumult which broke out in the presence of Hildebrand in the same town laid to rest; by this incontrovertible confession, the demand of our leader was satisfied in the Chapel which you mention, and the resuscitated pest, which had raised its head, stirred up by the wickedness of some people or other, was stamped out by the authority of the Archbishop of Besançon, and other learned men present.

---

[1] 'secundum naturae ordinem.'

[2] 'Dum Gervasii tunc capti' (Semisch, p. 159). De Roye, p. 50 (followed by Migne, 147, 1204a), altered the text to 'Geraldi tunc legati.' *Cf.* Sudendorf, p. 35.

Berengar must understand that no day for a discussion or argument on the matter would be fixed, no speeches *pro* and *con*, no witnesses, judges, pleaders, or audience would be allowed to come together. Eusebius would sever communications with anyone who disobeyed this injunction, for the case had been judicially settled three times in that province, and fourthly it had been extinguished by the ruling of a papal synod.[1]

[1] The letter is printed in Migne, 147, 1201–1204 ; de Roye, pp. 48–51 ; and by Semisch in the *Zeitschrift für historische Theol.* (1857), pp. 158–160. For the date of the letter (1063–65) *cf.* Sudendorf, p. 32 f., as emended by Bishop, p. 277 n. The basis for fixing the date is the concluding sentence ' causa ter Provinciae nostrae judicio terminata, quarto Sedis Apostolicae Synodi sententia extincta.' Mabillon (*Vetera Analecta*, p. 514) and Ceillier, xx. 294, dated the letter 1079, after the Roman Council of that year, but interpreted ' quarto ' as an ordinal in relation to ' concilio,' and so wrongly concluded that the series of councils referred to was Rome and Vercelli (1050), Rome (1059) and Rome (1079).

Sudendorf showed that this letter, as well as that of Berengar which called it forth, could not have been written before the Synod of Angers in 1062, nor after the death of Bougrin (1065 ; *cf.* Bishop), one of the bishops mentioned by Berengar in his letter (p. 140 f.). This conclusion was followed by Schwabe, p. 100 n. 1, and Schnitzer, p. 76 n. 1. It has been refused by Bröcking (*Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, v. 361 ff., vi. 232, xii. 344 ff. ; *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, xiii. 169 ff.), because it does not follow that all the bishops must have been alive when Berengar wrote to Eusebius (*ibid.* xiii. 170 f.). Halphen, p. 138 n. 1, follows Bröcking. The conclusions of the latter were challenged by Schnitzer in *Der Katholik* (Mainz), ii. (1892) 544 ff.

Bröcking (*Deut. Zeit. f. G.-W.*, v. 361 ff.) maintains that the last provincial synod mentioned by Eusebius is that of Angers, 1062, and the last Roman synod referred to by him as settling the dispute could not have been one which came before this date. It was thus the Synod of 1079, not 1059. Consequently the letter of Eusebius, and also that of Berengar, were written after the Synod of Rome, February 11, 1079.

Replying to Bröcking, Schnitzer contended that Eusebius did not refer to the four Councils in chronological order ; that the expression ' extincta ' applies as little to the Roman Council of 1079 as to that of 1059, for Berengar was not silenced by either Council, and that at neither date would the statement of Eusebius have suited the orthodox doctrine of the day. Bröcking has overlooked the strained relations between Berengar and Eusebius before 1079. We may add that the four councils referred to by Eusebius appear to have been Tours (1051 and 1054), Rome (1059) and Angers (1062).

Bröcking's answer (*Deut. Zeit. f. G.-W.*, xii. 344 ff.) produced little more than his previous argument. The word ' extincta ' cannot apply to the Roman Council of 1059, because the matter was again discussed in 1062, according to Eusebius' report. The term ' extincta ' strengthens the word ' terminata ' applied to the three provincial synods, and so refers to a synod held after them, otherwise Eusebius expresses himself badly. He cannot follow Schnitzer's logic when he alleges that ' extincta ' applies as little to 1079 as to 1059, for in that case Eusebius' head was as confused as Schnitzer's. He declines to discuss the relation of Eusebius' orthodoxy to the question. Eusebius

This letter contains no proof that Eusebius now abandoned Berengar, withheld from him all further support, and became fully orthodox on the eucharistic question himself.[1] Relations

---

does not write as a historian, taking note of chronological order. If Eusebius, according to Bröcking, does not refer to the Council of 1059, that was because he does not deal completely with the synodal decisions, as is proved by the fact that he does not mention Rome and Vercelli (1050). The letter of Alexander II to Bartholomew and Eusebius (Bishop, p. 274) does not prove that a breach existed in the relations of Eusebius and Berengar, but Bröcking admits that in his previous article he ought to have noticed the strained relations between them in the period before 1079 (*Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, xii. 349 n. 4).

The only fair comment in the whole of Bröcking's elaborate defence is his contention (*ibid.* p. 348 f.) that Schnitzer's argument *ex silentio*, from the absence of any reference to the Roman Council of 1079 by Berengar, is not material, for its proceedings did not greatly help his case, although Bröcking agrees with Schnitzer that they did, and so weakens his criticism. He slurs over some significant points, viz. Schnitzer's contention that 'extincta' applies as little to 1079 as to 1059; the question of Eusebius' orthodoxy; and in one or two instances he unwittingly concedes the force of Schnitzer's remarks, viz. by alleging that Eusebius does not deal as a historian chronologically with his details.

Bröcking's argument is built up on the interpretation of a single passage (the concluding sentence in Eusebius' letter reporting the three provincial synods and one Roman Council). It omits to notice that Eusebius' answer is concerned with a revival of the controversy which had recently taken place at Angers, that he refers to Hildebrand as 'Hildebrand' and not 'Gregory VII,' a curious slip if his letter was written after 1079. He does not perceive that in 1079, with seventeen years of the controversy in retrospect, Eusebius could not have referred to the controversy as having been stamped out in 1062. Moreover, Eusebius makes no reference to Berengar in his letter to Alexander II (Sudendorf, p. 222 ff.), so that the relations between the two were very strained in 1067 when that letter was written (*infra*, p. 151).

Bröcking states that the date of Berengar's letter to Eusebius depends on the date of Eusebius' answer (*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, xiii. 173). The reverse is true. If Berengar wrote in 1079 he would not have appealed to the proceedings of an obscure provincial synod which had taken place seventeen years before, nor was a man of about eighty years of age, who had endured the severe humiliation imposed upon him at Rome in 1079, likely to trouble much about the action of an obscure ecclesiastic at Angers seventeen years before. The setting of Berengar's letter is clearly that of the Synod of Angers (1062), and the action ascribed to the Canon Geoffrey is closely related to that Synod, at a time when it would have been peculiarly irritating to Berengar, who had interpreted Eusebius' action at the Synod as peculiarly favourable to himself. So that Sudendorf's date, as corrected by Bishop, for Berengar's letter to Eusebius may stand.

All parties are agreed that the reply of Eusebius followed within a year after Berengar's letter, so that Sudendorf's date, also corrected by Bishop for that letter, may also stand. Francke, p. 616, dates it *c.* 1063. The critical word 'quarto' was a loose expression referring to the Roman Council of 1059. We have seen that even Bröcking is compelled to admit that Eusebius did not write chronologically. The question of Eusebius' relation to Geoffrey Barbatus is discussed above in the text.

[1] Sudendorf, p. 145 ff.; Schnitzer, p. 78 f.; Ébersolt, p. 140 f.; the *Hist. Litt.*, viii. 101 ff.; and de Roye, p. 51 f., all contend for the return

between them were naturally strained after the refusal by the Bishop of a request to which Berengar attached considerable importance. There was nothing in Eusebius' doctrinal statement on the Eucharist in the letter to which Berengar would not readily have consented. If the Bishop alludes to the controversy as a pest, his reference is to the practical difficulty which the dispute was giving to the diocesan in his administration of ecclesiastical affairs. He does not charge Berengar with heresy, nor refer to any breach of orthodox teaching. That Eusebius' hand may have been strengthened by the hostility of Count Geoffrey Barbatus to Berengar, which by this time had been revealed, is probable. The attitude of both Count and Scolasticus constituted a difficult problem for the Bishop. But it is improbable that Eusebius now turned against Berengar solely with the object of pleasing Count Geoffrey.[1] In the opinion of contemporaries, Eusebius was a supporter of Berengar's teaching, if not the leader of the whole Berengarian movement,[2] and we do not read that this estimate was ever modified. By his recantation at Rome in 1059 Berengar escaped the repetition of the condemnation of 1050, and officially was regarded as a true member of the Church, so that there was no reason for his friends to fear that they might become involved in any judicial proceedings with the Curia. The Papacy at this date was willing to leave its servants to their private opinions on dogma, provided they did not by public action create disturbance or inspire doubts of orthodox teaching in the public mind. Thus, continued sympathy with Berengar's doctrinal views was quite consistent with the action taken against him by Eusebius in his letter.

to orthodoxy by Eusebius. Sudendorf, p. 146, attributes this to the influence of Count Fulk; and Schnitzer, p. 79, to that of Count Geoffrey Barbatus. Pletteau, p. 19, maintains that Eusebius was never involved in Berengar's heresy. But *cf. supra*, p. 84. Pletteau, p. 59 (*cf.* p. 22 n. 1), offers the curious suggestion that Eusebius did not venture to attack the great power of an Archdeacon.

[1] Bröcking (*Zeit. für K.-G.*, xiii. 170 ff.) and Halphen (p. 138 ff.) maintain that Eusebius continued to give his support to Berengar. Stäudlin, p. 55 ff.: 'Eusebius desired to reconcile both parties on the basis of an appeal to Scripture.' Gfrörer, *Allgemeine K.-G.*, iv. pt. i. 512: 'Eusebius now left Berengar to his fate.' Francke, p. 617: 'Eusebius now went over to the enemies of Berengar.' Schwabe, p. 100: 'Eusebius supported Geoffrey Barbatus in hostility to Berengar.'

[2] *Supra*, p. 88.

On the other hand, the Bishop did not actively protect him against the persecution of Geoffrey Barbatus, which began soon after the Synod of Angers (1062).[1] Whether the Count was genuinely inspired by orthodox zeal against the teaching of Berengar is not clear, but if not, he certainly made use of this as an excuse for hostile action.[2] Berengar was forbidden to enter Angers, and for several years was not able to exercise his function as Archdeacon there, and his revenues were withheld.[3] Neither Bartholomew, the Archbishop of Tours, nor Eusebius protected him.[4] In 1063 the Synod of Rouen repeated the formula drawn up against his teaching at Rouen in 1055.[5] The first canon of the Synod of Lisieux (1064) reaffirmed the orthodox faith on the Eucharist.[6] But the Papacy began to intervene on his behalf. Rahard, Provost of Orleans, and Quiriacus II, Bishop of Nantes, returned from Rome in 1063,[7] and brought with them the greetings of Pope Alexander II to Berengar, together with the intimation that the Pope intended to send one of his young relations to Berengar to be educated.[8]

Berengar was sufficiently encouraged to make an attempt to secure the definite intervention of the Papacy on his behalf. In 1064 [9] he wrote to Cardinal Stephen,[10] who was in Rome :

---

[1] Schwabe, p. 100 ; Schnitzer, p. 80. The time cannot be accurately fixed. The letter of Berengar to Cardinal Stephen (Sudendorf, p. 224 f.) suggests the date approximately. Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 26, dates it 1062.

[2] 'Epis.' of Alexander II to Bartholomew, Archbishop of Tours, and Eusebius of Angers (Bishop, p. 274). The Pope says that Geoffrey burned with zeal against Berengar in defence of the Christian faith, although it was not his business to deal with the question of the sacraments.

[3] 'Epis. of Berengar to Card. Stephen' (Sudendorf, p. 224); 'Epis.' of Alexander II to Bartholomew and Eusebius.

[4] *Cf.* the 'Epis. of Berengar to Stephen' and the 'Epis.' of Alexander to the two bishops.

[5] Migne, 143, 1382d. Pletteau, p. 40, says that Berengar's greatest following was in Normandy. The evidence points rather to Anjou, especially Tours.

[6] Delisle, *Journal des Savants* (August 1901), p. 517. Delisle thinks that the canon had direct reference to the Berengarian question (p. 18).

[7] Bishop, p. 278.

[8] *Cf.* a similar courtesy offered by Alexander to Lanfranc (Macdonald, p. 29 n. 2).

[9] The date is Bishop's (p. 279), correcting Sudendorf, p. 163 f., who dates it 1073. *Cf.* Schwabe, p. 100 f., and Halphen, p. 138 n. 2, who date it 1064. Schnitzer, p. 81, followed by Ébersolt, p. 142, has 1065.

[10] Probably the legate who presided at a synod at Tours on March 1, 1060 (Sudendorf, p. 167), when he made Berengar's acquaintance, even

In my anxiety I can only think of your activity at Rome, which has experience for every contingency and to which I would make known what has been done concerning me. Your kindness, well-disposed towards me in everything, will know that the hatred of the Court has disturbed all which the divine bounty gave me at Angers—access to the city, and attendance, which as a clerk and archdeacon I owed to the Church at Angers, has been for several years altogether denied to me. It were superfluous to urge you to pity my vicissitude, or to suggest in an official way, how the eminence of the Roman dignity ought to meet my great persecution. It is commonly said 'A friend and physician are proved by necessity.' For what reason I say this you can understand—for this certainly, that you will not disdain to discharge for me now a kindness, as much as you were never able to do before—that it may not be burdensome for you to secure the papal condescension to my devoted salutation. I was worthy of receiving his salutation and apostolic blessing through Rahard of Orleans, and the Bishop of Nantes, although not through a letter.[1] Therefore the merciful God will not deny to me a great benefit through you, if you are able to secure papal letters concerning me to the Archbishop and the Bishop of Le Mans and Angers, to check the madness of the envious, the insane and the dastardly. For this purpose no one occurs to me so suitable, so efficacious and so necessary, if you will not deny the labour of your love for this object. All that you desire from me by way of compensation shall be paid.[2] Let no expense deter you from this, I will repay your charges fourfold if you wish it. For the rest, brother Rahard has notified me that the Lord Pope is disposed to send here one of his relations, to be educated.[3] If he does decide this, let him not delay or procrastinate from seeing that he does come to us, and for the rest let him not be solicitous concerning his sojourn with us or return to him if he orders it so.[4]

It is noteworthy that Berengar writes to Cardinal Stephen and not to Hildebrand, and that he says that there was no one else in Rome to whom he might make his request. At Tours in 1054 and at Rome in 1059 the Cardinal-Archdeacon had disappointed Berengar by refraining from intervening with

---

if he did not know him before. Schwabe, p. 101, agrees, but refers to the synod at Angers of that year.

[1] Bishop, p. 277, sees a complaint against the Pope here.

[2] The sentence is incomplete in the MS. (Sudendorf, p. 225 n. c).

[3] Loofs, p. 575, thinks that this was the relation of the Pope referred to in Lanfranc's letter ('Epis.' iii. Giles). Schwabe, p. 110, suggests that this was the nephew of Alexander to whom the monks of S. Aubin's, Angers, appealed in 1070 (quoting Martène and Durand, i. 201).

[4] Sudendorf, pp. 224 f.; *cf.* 163 ff.

decision on his behalf. It was therefore natural that the Scolasticus should seek the aid of one of the other cardinals for his new endeavour to obtain the ear of the Papacy. After the death of Humbert on May 5, 1061, Hildebrand was the chief adviser of the Curia until his own elevation to the Papacy in 1073. He must have been aware of any action taken on behalf of Berengar, and no doubt tacitly supported it, or at least did not interfere.[1] There is no evidence, until Berengar forced his hand at the Roman Council of 1079, that Hildebrand ever instituted repressive measures against him, and it is not unwarrantable to suggest that the kindly efforts made by the Papacy on behalf of Berengar during this period were approved, if not deliberately promoted, by Hildebrand.

Whether Cardinal Stephen, without further correspondence with Berengar, engaged the sympathies of Alexander II for the Scolasticus, or whether he persuaded Berengar to write directly to the Pope,[2] Berengar received a letter of kindly condolence from Alexander. The Pope addressed him as 'the venerable presbyter,' and continued :

> Having seen your letter, we offer you the sympathy due to your trouble and wretchedness. But if you can bear them patiently you will certainly deserve that the divine mercy should flow abundantly towards you. So indeed we are informed in the books by the sweet promise of our Redeemer, 'Blessed are they who endure persecution for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.'[3]

---

[1] *Cf.* Schwabe, p. 110 (*cf.* p. 120), who also suggests that the Curia did not wish to arouse a new enemy in Berengar at this time. But in what sense could he be a new enemy ? Schwabe contends that the Papacy feared that Berengar might go over to its political enemies, but the close connection of Berengar with French, and especially Angevine, politics was the thesis of Schwabe for the earlier period.

[2] This is the conjecture of Bishop, p. 279. I have followed his chronology for the period. Schwabe, p. 101 ff., and Schnitzer, p. 79 ff., slightly rearrange the sequence.

[3] Bishop, p. 273. Schwabe, p. 103, says that this letter does not indicate that Alexander II thought Berengar had remained loyal to his submission at Rome in 1059, especially as the letter to Bartholomew makes it clear that Alexander was aware of differences on the eucharistic question in Anjou.

Is this the letter mentioned by Pletteau (p. 39), in which he says that Alexander urged Berengar to maintain his recantation ? Pletteau also says that Berengar replied refusing to comply. But this reply does not appear in the sources.

This letter was accompanied or followed by another directed to Bartholomew, Archbishop of Tours,[1] and to Eusebius, Bishop of Angers. The Pope says that Count Geoffrey Barbatus had been stirred up by certain people who were enemies of Berengar to hatred of the Scolasticus, as if he (the Count) were burning for the defence of the Christian faith. Berengar, frightened by the threats of Geoffrey, dared not exercise his function as Archdeacon in the church at Angers. The bishops are charged to warn the Count, on the authority of the Curia, not to disturb Berengar any further. It was not the Count's business to interfere in a dispute on the Eucharist.[2] Berengar's request that the Bishop of Le Mans might be admonished by the Pope was not fulfilled, possibly on account of the death of Bougrin (May 10, 1065), or because of political incidents at Le Mans.[3]

About the same time the Pope wrote to Geoffrey, expressing surprise that he had despised the authority of the blessed Peter, and had not obeyed, but persistently disobeyed, the directions sent to him. He commands Geoffrey to desist from persecuting Berengar, whose life and conversation are, by the report of good men, worthy of God, so that there could be no doubt that true charity rules in him. Clearly his assiduity in alms-giving can hardly be equalled by that of any bishop. So Geoffrey is ordered not to disturb him, but, preserving the honour of the holy Roman Church, he is to give him opportunity to remain in his office so that he may happily reach the door of salvation.[4]

The embassy [5] referred to in this letter was either the authority given to the Archbishop of Tours and the Bishop of Angers by the Pope's letter, already quoted,[6] or a special messenger sent to Tours.[7] But Geoffrey remained obdurate, and the persecution of Berengar continued. So the Pope wrote again to Geoffrey, reminding him that he had frequently urged him to desist from insulting Berengar and from interfering with his revenues, so that he might be free to obtain his income, to conduct his business, to carry on his office, and to feel that in the Count he had a protector and helper. If Geoffrey continued to disobey, no further admonition would be issued, but excommunication would follow.[1]

---

[1] Pletteau, p. 22, says (without giving an authority) that Bartholomew became suspected of Berengar's heresy.

[2] Bishop, p. 274.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 274 n. If this conjecture is correct, this letter and probably that to Geoffrey must be dated *c.* 1065.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 273 f.

[5] 'nostre legatione.'

[6] *Cf.* Bishop, p. 277; Schnitzer, p. 83 n. 3; Halphen, p. 139 n. 2. Schwabe, p. 102, suggests that Rahard and Quiriacus formed this embassy.

[7] Bishop, p. 279.

Still the Count paid no heed to the papal warnings, and by this time was involved in a violent dispute with the Abbey of Marmoutier at Tours, and with Bartholomew, the Archbishop, so that if Berengar suffered increased persecution, this was because, as a Canon of S. Martin's, he became involved in Geoffrey's dispute with Archbishop Bartholomew. The quarrel arose over the question of lay-election, or investiture, which was assuming burning proportions all over western Europe. On May 20, 1064, Albert, the Abbot of Marmoutier, a supporter of Berengar, had died. On January 26, 1065,[2] the monks elected Bartholomew, who is to be distinguished from the Archbishop of Tours. Geoffrey Barbatus ordered the new abbot to receive investiture with the symbols of his office from himself.[3] Although the right had been conceded to the Courts of Anjou in the case of many other abbeys, the right of free election at Marmoutier had been expressly preserved at the cession of Touraine to Geoffrey Martel in 1044. Geoffrey Barbatus threatened to destroy the monastery if Bartholomew did not submit, and violently rejected the intercession of no less a personage than Hugh, Abbot of Cluny. The Count shouted that he knew how to subdue these monks like asses, and when the Abbot of Cluny, with an imploring gesture, grasped the flap of his mantle, Geoffrey tore off the buckle and left him without further reply.[4] The monks remained obdurate and he confiscated their goods, harried the abbey lands, and subjected its members to personal ill-treatment.[1]

---

[1] Bishop, p. 274 f. As the letter makes no reference to Marmoutier or Le Mans, it probably preceded the incidents which are next recorded above.

[2] Mabillon, *Annales*, iv. 658; *Ex Gestis Consul. Andegav.* (Bouq., xi. 271c). *Cf.* Sudendorf, p. 149; Halphen, p. 139.

[3] *Gesta Consulum Andegav.* (MS. Lat. 6006, Bibl. Nat.), quoted by Halphen, p. 140 n. 1.

[4] Halphen, p. 140.

On May 10, 1065,[2] Bougrin, Bishop of Le Mans, died. Through the instrumentality of William of Normandy, a Norman named Arnold was elected to the see.[3] Geoffrey prohibited Bartholomew, Archbishop of Tours, from consecrating him.[4] The clergy of Le Mans appealed to the Pope, who wrote ordering Bartholomew to proceed with the election, and warned the Count not to interfere.[5] In reply, Geoffrey harried the buildings and lands of the cathedral church of S. Maurice at Tours. The dwellings of the Archbishop and canons were destroyed, their goods were removed, and they were driven from the city.[6] Whether Berengar, who

---

[1] *Chron. Consulum Andegav.* (Marchegay and Salmon, p. 136; Bouquet, xi. 272a f.). This attack is to be distinguished from his attack on the cathedral church of S. Maurice (*cf.* letter of Hugh of Lyons, Bouq., xiv. 791b): 'pro multimoda injuria quam inferebat Turonensi ecclesiae et abbati S. Martini Majoris Monasterii excommunicatus erat.'

[2] *Gall. Christ.*, xiv. 371d; Piolin, *Hist. de l'Église du Mans*, iii. 267, has 1064. Sudendorf, p. 150, has 1066.

[3] Halphen, p. 141.

[4] 'Epis. of Bartholomew to Alexander II' (Sudendorf, p. 221). Halphen, p. 141, remarks that it was an act of sound politics to oppose Duke William, but that Geoffrey's method was wrong, because it alienated the clergy of Anjou and Touraine.

[5] *Neues Archiv*, vii. 160 (quoted by Halphen, p. 141 n. 5).

[6] 'Epis. of Bartholomew to Alexander II' (Sudendorf, p. 221): 'omnia mea et ecclesiae dissipavit, meam atque canonicorum domos subruit et ab ipsa civitatis habitatione exturbavit.' *Cf.* Ébersolt, p. 143; Schnitzer, p. 82 f. 'Epis. of Eusebius to Alexander II' (Sudendorf, p. 222): 'Hic ergo, conventus de abominabili vecordia sua, qua matri suae, ecclesiae Turonensi, manum injicere et, quanta erat, in terram detrahere non veritus fuerat, nihilominus detestabili persuasione beati Martini adhortus ecclesiam.'

Halphen, p. 141 n. 4, correctly denies that any attack was made upon S. Martin's collegiate church: 'C'est a tort qu'on a cru d'ordinaire qu'il s'agissait là de Saint Martin de Tours'; but says wrongly that only Marmoutier was attacked: 'nous ne connaissons de différend de Geoffroi le Barbe qu'avec Saint Martin de Marmoutier.' Bartholomew speaks of canons', not monks', dwellings. S. Maurice and not the abbey was harried. Bartholomew's reference to his own dwelling and to the 'concanonicorum domus' proves this, unless Bartholomew refers to S. Martin's the collegiate church, but his reference to 'my goods' seems to preclude this. We have on the contrary no account of an attack on the abbey buildings, although the abbey lands were wasted and the goods of the inmates were confiscated. All this is consonant with Geoffrey's political relationships. The affair of the Bishop of Le Mans accentuated his antagonism towards Normandy, and the intervention of the Archbishop in this matter excited him more than the attitude of the monks of Marmoutier on the election of their Abbot. The letter of Bartholomew shows that Berengar was involved, although this need not imply that S. Martin's had been attacked. Probably even Geoffrey hesitated to destroy abbey was not a Canon of S. Maurice, suffered loss during this attack, is not clear, although the Count's hostility towards Berengar was increased when the Archbishop, in obedience to the Pope's orders, tried to hinder his persecution of the Scolasticus.[1]

These events were followed by the attempt of Bartholomew to secure the formal condemnation of Geoffrey by the French clergy. At a royal assembly held by Philip of France[2] at Orleans, when many bishops and Count Geoffrey were present, Bartholomew denounced 'his madness' to his face. But neither clergy nor laity were able to quell his wrath, even when they pointed out, with the King's consent, that by attacking a royal archbishop, Geoffrey was doing injury to his lord the King.[3] Thereupon Bartholomew and the French bishops excommunicated Geoffrey, and the Archbishop wrote to Alexander II asking him to confirm the sentence and to order the suffragans of Tours, especially Eusebius of Angers, to abstain from communication with the excommunicated Count, and not to wrong the Church, by disobeying, through a craven fear of him.[4]

However, the turbulent rule of this 'Nero of our time,'[5]

---

buildings, especially one so well revered as Marmoutier. He must have been aware that Angevine tradition supported its claim. The same confusion is made by Sudendorf, p. 149 ff., and Schwabe, p. 104 f. Loofs p. 576, cleared up the difficulty. Neither Bartholomew (Sudendorf, p. 221), nor Eusebius (*ibid.* p. 222) refers to an attack on the collegiate church of S. Martin, but on the cathedral (which Loofs omits to call S. Maurice). *Cf.* the letter of Hugh of Lyons (Bouq., xi. 791b; *supra*, p. 148 n. 1) which refers to injuries done by Geoffrey to both S. Maurice and the abbey, though without referring to destruction of buildings in either case. On the confusion of Sudendorf and Schwabe on S. Martin's and Marmoutier, *cf. supra*, p. 72 n. 6.

[1] 'Epis. of Bartholomew to Alexander II' (Sudendorf, p. 221): 'Hac de causa et quia eum ab odio et persecutore fratris Berengarii ex admonitione tua compescere attemptaveram. . . .'

[2] Succeeded Henry I in 1060.

[3] The Archbishop of Tours was nominated by the King of France. *Cf.* Imbart de la Tours, p. 244 n. 1.

[4] 'Epis. of Bartholomew to Alexander II' (Sudendorf, p. 221 f.); written in 1066 (Halphen, p. 142 n. 3; Sudendorf, p. 148 ff., gives 1066–67). Schnitzer, p. 79, suggests that while Bartholomew feared that Eusebius was plotting with Geoffrey Barbatus, the Bishop of Angers was actually arranging to desert to his brother, Count Fulk (quoting Maan, p. 91 n. xiii.). Schwabe, p. 105 f., holds that at this date Eusebius was on friendly terms with Geoffrey, but fell away from him after his excommunication by Cardinal Stephen.

[5] *Cf.* Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Franc.*, ii. 46 (Migne, 71, 412c), who described Chilperic in the same terms.

this 'angel of Satan transforming himself into an angel of light,' [1] was drawing to a mournful end. Even Eusebius, the Bishop of Angers, whose loyalty to the house of Geoffrey Martel had been undeviating, deserted him.[2] On February 23, 1067, his brother, Fulk Rechin, seized Saumur. In the month of March Cardinal Stephen, who had been sent in answer to the Archbishop's letter,[3] held a synod in that town at which the excommunication of Geoffrey Barbatus, already issued by Archbishop Bartholomew, was formally confirmed by the legate.[4] Count Fulk signed the decree of excommunication, March 11, 1067. The Bishops of Angers, Le Mans, and Nantes concurred.[5] The synod did not issue a decree of deposition against Geoffrey, but his brother was left free to continue his operations against him.[6] On April 4 Fulk seized Angers, captured his brother, and imprisoned him.[7] But this treatment was more severe than the Papacy desired, and, through the intervention of Alexander II, Fulk released his brother [8] by July 16.[9] Early next year (1068) the conflict between the brothers broke out again, and by April Geoffrey was again captured and imprisoned in the Castle of Chinon, where he remained until 1096,[1] when Pope Urban II ordered his release; but by that time he had lost his reason, and was left in prison by the direction of the legate Hugh, Archbishop of Lyons.[2]

---

[1] 'Epis. of Bartholomew to Alexander II' (Sudendorf, p. 221) and 'Epis. of Eusebius to Alexander II' (*ibid.* p. 222). The use of the same expression suggests the same scribe. On the other hand, the description of Geoffrey Barbatus as an 'angel of Satan,' coined perhaps at Tours, may have passed over to Angers and so into general use. It would be unsafe to suggest that Bartholomew and Eusebius could not compose their own letters, although Sudendorf (p. 139) has appealed to a similar parallel in another letter of Bartholomew and in one of Berengar's (*ibid.* pp. 219, 231) as evidence that Berengar wrote the former for the Archbishop.

[2] 'Epis. of Bartholomew' (*ibid.* p. 222): 'ut suffraganei provinciae et inter eas egregie episcopus Andegavensis . . . ne juste excommunicatis communicent.' This shows that shortly before the Synod at Orleans (*supra*, p. 149) Eusebius was on friendly terms with Geoffrey.

[3] Sudendorf, p. 221 f. ('Epis. of Bartholomew to Alexander II').

[4] Bouq., xi. 791b; Planchenault, p. 19 (no. 16).

[5] 'Epis. of Eusebius' (Sudendorf, p. 222 f.). Halphen, p. 145, maintains that Eusebius was not present, because he did not sign the decree. But there seems to be no reason for refusing the statement of Eusebius, which he repeats in the same letter. Sudendorf (p. 158) places this synod after Geoffrey's release.

[6] Halphen, p. 145.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 146.

[8] Marchegay and Mabille, p. 379.

[9] Bertrand de Brousillon, *La Maison de Craon*, i. 39. A document dated July 16, 1067, is referred to 'the seventh year of Count Geoffrey.' *Cf.* Halphen, p. 146 n. 4. But is there any reason why this charter should not have been drawn up while Geoffrey was still in prison? The action of his brother may have been regarded as a usurpation.

The accession of Fulk to the territories of his brother alleviated, for a time, the persecution which Berengar had suffered from the Count of Anjou. He seems to have supported the policy of both Fulk and Eusebius, and of the clergy and people of Tours, which opposed the appointment of Radulf by Philip of France, in succession to Bartholomew, as Archbishop of Tours.[3] For a time the Papacy approved the opposition to Philip, doubtless in accordance with its campaign against lay-election; but in later years Radulf received recognition from the Curia, and proved a strong supporter of its action against simony.[4] In the meantime Fulk appears to have left the eucharistic controversy to take its course, and if he did not persecute Berengar, still less did he give him the active assistance which the Scolasticus had enjoyed in the days of Geoffrey Martel. From the beginning of the eucharistic controversy he had been involved in Angevine politics, and had experienced the extremes of favourable and hostile treatment from the Counts of Anjou, but now he found himself ignored by the Angevine Court.[5] A similar attitude was adopted towards him by his old supporter Eusebius, Bishop of Angers. If we read of no hostility shown by the Bishop, as modern writers have suggested, yet the earlier friendship drifted into an attitude of indifference on the part of Eusebius to the fortunes of Berengar, which reflected the attitude of Count Fulk.

---

[1] Orderic Vitalis, iii. 477 (Le Prévost); Halphen, p. 147, with n. 4. The date of Geoffrey's second imprisonment is fixed by the reference in Eusebius' letter (Sudendorf, p. 223) to the death of Bartholomew, Archbishop of Tours, shortly before. This was on April 9.

[2] Bouq., xiv. 791b–c; *cf.* xii. 664 n.

[3] *Narratio Controversiae* (Bouq., xii. 450). An account of this dispute appears in Eusebius' letter to Alexander II (Sudendorf, p. 222 ff.). Philip was only claiming an ancient right (Imbart de la Tours, p. 244 n. 1).

[4] Schwabe, p. 109; Sudendorf, p. 161 f.

[5] Schwabe, p. 107, thinks that Fulk supported the Curia in return for its sanction of his action against Geoffrey Barbatus, and that he was opposed to Berengar with whom, hitherto, he had scarcely come in contact. But Schwabe declines to admit that Fulk supported the anti-simonist policy of the Church so strongly as Giesebrecht claims (iii. 215). Giesebrecht makes use of a letter which Sudendorf (p. 235 ff.) says was sent by Fulk to Gregory VII (1071–73). But the letter can hardly be assigned to Fulk.

But the loss of Eusebius Bruno's open support was more than counterbalanced by Alexander II's compassionate toleration, and by the policy of the Curia towards him during these years. Moreover, his new troubles in Anjou and Touraine rallied to him friends whose loyalty had been weakened by the reports of the Synod of Tours (1054) and the Roman Council of 1059, and perhaps by Berengar's literary activity. We have seen that after the Synod of Tours Berengar wrote to Drogo of Paris defending his own interpretation of the doctrine of the Eucharist, especially against Drogo's view that he could not claim support from Augustine. The strained relationship between the two friends was now relieved. Possibly reports of Count Geoffrey's ill-treatment of Berengar had revived Drogo's former loyalty towards him. If so, the rapprochement was reciprocal. About this time Drogo became ill, and Berengar seized the opportunity to write to him a letter which was quite free from the querulous complaint of his last epistle.

> To Drogo, the well-beloved brother in the Lord Jesus, Berengar sends greeting, worthy of a lord, worthy of his learning. I know I ought to have written to you far otherwise, but after I had heard that God had restored to me the solace of your kindness, I thought better to write to you than to ignore any longer the moderation of God's dealing with you. Moreover, it was in my mind to offer to your dignity, by the speedy pen of a letter, whatever the office of my love could do for you as a blessing. God is my witness that I have not more gladly written to you, than I should be to see you and hear you, to enjoy your personal observation and conversation, if He had made it safe for me to go anywhere to see my friends. Farewell! May the equality and inseparability of the godhead and of eternity graciously preserve your love for me uninjured.[1]

---

[1] Sudendorf, p. 220. He dates this letter 1066–71 (p. 147), *i.e.* between Geoffrey's persecution of Berengar and Drogo's promotion to the archdeaconry of Paris. Drogo signed a document as Archdeacon in 1067 (*Gallia Christiana*, vii. 35, *Instrumentum* no. xl.), and in 1071 (*Gallia Christiana*, vii. 37, *Instrumentum* no. xlii.; *cf.* Sudendorf, p. 88). But Berengar was free from attacks by Geoffrey after April 1068, and as he hints at these troubles ('si mihi summa divinitas satis tutum fecisset inopiam progredi et amicos invisere'), the letter was not written after 1068. As Geoffrey's attacks began at Angers, 1062–63, this letter should be dated 1062/3–April 1068.

A passage in the long epistle of Gozechin, the Scolasticus of Mainz, to Walcher, his successor as Scolasticus at Liège, includes Drogo among the enemies of Berengar. Gozechin says that Hermann of Reims, Huormann of Speier, and Mainhard of Bamberg, who had formerly been attracted by Berengar's teaching, had now surrendered it. This letter was written about 1069,[1] and need not indicate that the renewal of friendship between Berengar and Drogo was not lasting. Gozechin was writing at Mainz,[2] where the contents of a private correspondence, about 1068, between Berengar and Drogo could scarcely have been known to him, and obviously could not have percolated through by devious routes so soon as 1069. Even if it had done so it was improbable that Gozechin would give much attention to it. His object in writing to Walcher was to condemn the Berengarian teaching, and especially its author. He therefore made use of public reports of Drogo's hostility, which had been in circulation for some years.[3]

The chief significance of Gozechin's letter, which has the proportions of a treatise, lies in its testimony to the spread of Berengar's teaching, through the medium of his scholars, when they had left Tours. 'See what a sound doctrine, what a healthy discipline issues from the academy of theology at Tours, where Berengar, that apostle of Satan, presides.[4] . . . Those heavenly sacraments which are consecrated on the altar, they say are not actual, but a shadow, and—a thing the tongue flees from, and at which the ears are horrified—they maintain that the sacraments are subject to material destruction by the processes of digestion.'[1] All this was due, wrote Gozechin, to sophistical disputation and the sharpness of carnal learning.[2] Yet, as we have seen, it is improbable that Berengar's propaganda extended beyond the ranks of the educated clergy.[3]

---

[1] Sudendorf, p. 32, quoting Mabillon, *Vet. Analecta*, p. 437 ff., dates this letter *c.* 1060, after the death of the Emperor Henry III (1056) and Liutbold, Archbishop of Mainz (1059), events mentioned by Gozechin. But Schwabe, p. 22 ff., shows that the date must be ten years later (*c.* 1069), for Gozechin refers to two lustra of troublous years following upon the deaths of the Emperor and Archbishop. Schwabe (p. 131) also denies that Gozechin intended to represent Drogo, etc., as enemies of Berengar. Gozechin means that they were indifferent to him. *Cf.* Schnitzer, p. 124 n. 6.

[2] Migne, 143, 889c.

[3] Sudendorf, pp. 32, 88 (*cf.* p. 115), quotes the letter of Gozechin in support of his contention that Drogo became openly hostile to Berengar. Sudendorf over-emphasises the significance of Gozechin's remark, as the correspondence between Berengar and Drogo shows. No definite date can be derived from Gozechin's letter for the time of the strained relations between the two friends. Gozechin reports rumours which must have been circulating long before he wrote to Walcher.

[4] Migne, 143, 900c.

[1] Migne, 143, 900c f.

[2] *Ibid.* 901a.

[3] *Supra*, p. 119 ff.

CHAPTER IX

LITERARY WARFARE

THE enemies of Berengar did not rest, and at this time his most watchful and persistent opponent took a step which might have upset Alexander II's kindly toleration of Berengar if the Pope had lived much longer. Whether Berengar's pamphlet, written between the autumn of 1059 and the year 1062,[1] reached Lanfranc immediately, or was delayed by the persecution of the Scolasticus by Geoffrey Barbatus, which broke out in the latter year, is not known. But between the years 1066 and 1068 or 1069 Lanfranc replied in a treatise, the *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, which he directed to Berengar in the form of a letter.[2] It is divided into twenty-

---

[1] *Supra*, p. 134.

[2] In the book itself Lanfranc uses the perfect tense when referring to Humbert: 'qui humiliter vixit, humiliter docuit' (Migne, 150, 412d). Humbert was therefore dead when Lanfranc wrote, so the book was not written before May 5, 1061, the date of Humbert's death, unless, like the record of the Roman Council of 1079, this passage was added later, and for this there is no evidence. In his 'Epis. to Alexander II' (Giles, i. 27), written in 1072, after the Council of Winchester (Macdonald, p. 93), Lanfranc says that he wrote the treatise when Abbot of Caen. He became Abbot in 1063 (*ibid.* p. 56), but was not formally instituted until July 16, 1066, and since 1063 had been completing the building of the Abbey which was begun in 1060 (*ibid.* p. 56 n. 2). It is improbable, therefore, that he began the book before July 1066, and that date constitutes a terminus post quem. Berengar's reply, the *De Sacra Cœna*, does not refer to Lanfranc as Archbishop, and so was written before August 29, 1070, the date when Lanfranc was consecrated at Canterbury (*ibid.* p. 66). Allowing a year or so for the composition of Lanfranc's book, the terminus ante quem for his treatise is 1068–69, and we have an approximate date for the work, July 1066–68/9.

The date 1059–62 given in my *Lanfranc*, p. 51 n. 1, which also attributes the work to Lanfranc's period at Bec, must now be surrendered. It was based on the statement of D'Achery (Migne, 150, 25a) and Baronius (*ibid.* 25b). Baronius, *Annales Eccles.*, pp. 17, 153, dates it 1059. Their authority appears to have been the late testimony of John Bromton (Twysden, p. 952) and Henry of Knighton (i. 46), who say that Lanfranc wrote it when Prior of Bec, 1057–63. The only early authority for its three chapters, and the second to the seventeenth of these are headed, and sometimes subdivided, by verbatim quotations from Berengar's pamphlet, which serve as texts for Lanfranc's reply. From chapters eighteen to twenty-three Lanfranc develops his own theory in a more discursive form. The treatise opens with the usual expression of a desire to meet his correspondent in conference.[1] Lanfranc then charges him with wrongly quoting Augustine, Gregory, Jerome, and other writers.[2] Berengar was not content with overthrowing the faith of weak men, but circulated his writings in various places, through his disciples.[3] Although his teaching and writings had been condemned at Rome under Nicholas II,[4] Berengar had gone back upon his submission in the pamphlet which Lanfranc now undertook to answer.[5]

He begins with a defence of Cardinal Humbert against Berengar's attacks. He criticises Berengar's allegation that Humbert belonged to the unpopular Burgundian race, and maintains that he was a Lotharingian[6] whom Leo IX took

composition at Bec is that of Alberic (Bouq., xi. 354 f.), but it carries little weight against Lanfranc's own statement that it was written at Caen, which formerly I regarded as a reference to another letter, following Sigebert (Migne, 160, 583b) and the *Hist. Litt.*, viii. 280. Both say that Lanfranc does not refer to the *De Corp.* in his letter to Alexander.

Mabillon first dated it 1063–70 (*Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 57), and later corrected this to 1069 (*Annales*, v. 19). The *Hist. Litt.*, viii. 280, gives 1079. Lessing, p. 65, corrected this date and placed it 1063–69, before Lanfranc was raised to Canterbury. He was followed by Stäudlin, p. 61, and Sudendorf, p. 39. Schwabe, p. 113, says vaguely that it was written when Abbot of Caen and shortly before Lanfranc became Archbishop. De Crozals, p. 83, has 1059–60. Schnitzer, p. 86, has 1069. Vernet (Vacant and Mangenot, v. 1218) gives 1063–70. Böhmer, *Die Fälschungen Erzb. Lanf.* (1902), p. 117 n. 3, dates it 1069–70.

That the work was originally despatched as a letter to Berengar is shown by the address, 'Lanfrancus misericordia Dei catholicus, Berengario Catholicae Ecclesiae adversario' (Migne, 150, 407a), and by a statement in the body of the treatise: 'Plurima enim ac prolixa vel testimonia Scripturarum . . . epistolaris brevitas inseri non permittit' (*ibid.* 430b). He also calls it a letter in his epistle to Alexander II: 'Epistolam, quam Berengario schismatico dum adhuc Cadomensi coenobio praeessem, transmisi, paternitati vestrae, sicut praecepistis, transmittere curavi' (Giles, i. 27).

The treatise appears in Migne, 150, 407–442, in Giles, *Opera Lanfranci*, ii. 147–199. I have used Migne's edition, which is a reprint of Giles, on account of the more easy access to it.

[1] Migne, 150, 407a, 408a. [2] *Ibid.* 408a. [3] *Ibid.* 409b.

[4] *Ibid.* 409b: 'Et caetera . . . damnata sunt.' [5] *Ibid.* 409c.

[6] *Ibid.* 409d. But Lanfranc does not make out his case (*Hist. Litt.*, vii. 527). The terms were interchangeable, Burgundy and Lorraine

with him to Rome for missionary work among the Sicilians, and afterwards made a Cardinal-Bishop of the Roman Church. His faith and doctrine were widely known throughout the Latin world, and his counsel was pre-eminent at the Curia. But even if he was a Burgundian, it was foolish and arrogant to object to him on account of his nationality,[1] as if God could not find servants among the Burgundians.[2] He then includes the oath sworn by Berengar at Rome in 1059, and charges him with quoting merely a sentence from it, in his pamphlet, in order to deceive his readers and to make them believe that he had not used these words.[3] At Rome Berengar had not dared to defend his views, but demanded from Pope Nicholas and the Council that a written statement of what he ought to believe should be handed to him. Humbert was ordered to draw up this formula, and Berengar took it, read it, confessed with an oath that he believed it, and subscribed it with his own hand.[4] This oath Nicholas sent to all the churches, wherever Berengar's teaching had spread, and the faithful rejoiced in his conversion. Why did he attribute this oath to Humbert rather than to himself, or Pope Nicholas, or the Council, or all the churches which received it ?[5] He had compared himself and Humbert with David and Goliath, but the simile would have been fitting if he had compared himself with Goliath, since he was arrogant and made use of opinions which would cut his own throat ; and if he had compared Humbert with David, who was a humble member of the Church, fighting for the Church.[6]

Lanfranc then recapitulates the events of the Councils of Rome and Vercelli in the time of Leo IX, and the Synod of Tours which he places in the pontificate of Victor II.[7] It is significant that he does not mention Hildebrand in this section of his account. Had a coolness come between them ? This rapid survey was made in order to show that the opinions of Humbert issued not from ' the mob, and Paschasius, and

---

were geographically contiguous. Whitney (*Camb. Hist. Journal*, i. 3 (1925), p. 237 n. 3) prefers Lanfranc's statement to Berengar's. But Berengar was usually correct in details. On this point he is supported by Cardinal Benno (*M.G.H. SS.*, xi. 671). *Cf.* F. Thaner, *Libelli de Lite*, i. 95 n. 1.

[1] Migne, 150, 410a.

[2] *Ibid.* 426b.

[3] *Ibid.* 410c.

[4] *Ibid.* 411d.

[5] *Ibid.* 412a.

[6] *Ibid.* 412d.

[7] *Ibid.* 413a–d.

Lanfranc,' as Berengar alleged, but formed the view of the Catholic Church, although they certainly were not held by Berengar or his following, who preferred proudly to separate themselves and to make a schism, rather than to be humble members of the Church, and to maintain common faith with it in a healthy manner.[1] Lanfranc preferred to be rather a simple man with the mob and a stupid Catholic than a courtier and an elegant heretic with Berengar.[2]

He was not concerned with Berengar's alternatives that if the bread and wine of the altar only are sacraments, or if the bread and wine of the altar only are the true body and blood of Christ, in either case the elements of bread and wine remained. He was not asked to believe this by the Roman Council, nor was it delivered to him by Humbert. The first proposition was his own, the second was held by no one. Lanfranc was concerned only with the formula drawn up at Rome, by the denial of which Berengar now committed perjury, in the little work which Lanfranc had received to be destroyed. Pope Nicholas, understanding that Berengar denied that there was a material change in the elements, granted him leave to defend his position, but Berengar had not dared to do this. Then it was that from compassion the Pope granted his request that the formula, already quoted, should be handed to him.[3] So, if Berengar went back on the words of the oath which had been handed to him, he was guilty of perjury. 'O! unhappy man. O! wretched soul. Why did you swear that you believed that which you yourself understood quite otherwise? Would it not have been better, if you thought you had the truth, to have ended your life by an honest death, than to swear perfidiously and to abjure your faith?'[4] Lanfranc defends Humbert against Berengar's charge that the former could not escape from the belief that the bread and wine remained on the altar by taking refuge in the statement that it survived in a supermaterial [5] form. To speak of the Roman Church as a Church of malignants, a Council of vanity and chair of Satan was to say what no heretic, schismatic, or false Christian had ever said before.[6]

---

[1] Migne, 150, 414a.
[2] *Ibid.* 414b–c.
[3] *Ibid.* 415b–c.
[4] *Ibid.* 414c–d.
[5] *Ibid.* 419a–b: 'supersubstantialem.'
[6] *Ibid.* 426b–c.

The remainder of Lanfranc's first seventeen chapters are occupied chiefly with a refutation of Berengar's quotations from Augustine and Ambrose,[1] and with quotations from those Fathers which Lanfranc himself discusses in support of his own arguments.[2] He quotes Gregory[3] and Cyprian[4] and makes frequent reference to the Scriptures.

The second part of the treatise,[5] in which Lanfranc develops his own theory of the Eucharist, consists mainly of an exegesis of passages of the Fathers, taken from the writings of Augustine[6] and Ambrose,[7] although statements of Jerome,[8] Gregory,[9] and Leo the Great[10] receive attention. Lanfranc's chief contribution to the development of the doctrine was his theory of a change of essence which did not involve a change of accidence. It only remained for Guitmund to substitute the theory of a change of substance, and the terminology as well as the theory of Transubstantiation had been worked out.[11] The *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini* does not rise to the level of Guitmund's great work on the Eucharist. Still less does it contain the philosophic insight and originality of illustration of Berengar's own work, the *De Sacra Cœna*, nor does it present a more orderly and methodical treatment than Berengar's book. Indeed, so far as Berengar follows Lanfranc's points almost seriatim, the disorganisation of his own work is partly a reflection of Lanfranc's method, although the *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini* is not marred by the constant and wearisome repetition of the *De Sacra Cœna*. Perhaps the qualities of a sustained and closely reasoned treatise, which had marked the work of Paschasius Radbert and of Ratramn in the ninth century, and were revived again in the treatises of Durand and Guitmund in the eleventh, could not be expected in a work which was undertaken as a polemical letter, and was chiefly concerned with the defence of Cardinal Humbert, an ecclesiastic who aroused Lanfranc's admiration, because his clear mode of thought and promptitude of action were entirely approved by the latter. As he proceeded, the letter grew into a treatise, and finally Lanfranc was compelled, in order to elucidate his own position, to add five more chapters, which were meant to present a constructive treatment of the subject. After the Roman Council of 1079 the work was revised and a section describing Gregory VII's action, and including the oath then submitted to Berengar, was inserted in the middle of Chapter II.[1] Like Berengar, Lanfranc does not allude to Durand's work. In the following century the *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini* received attention out of all proportion to its merits.[2] That was probably because of his fame as Prior of Bec and Archbishop of Canterbury. The writers of the next generation assigned to him the chief part in the overthrow of Berengar and his teaching. Yet if any controversialist of the day is to be selected for this part, Cardinal Humbert,[3] rather than Lanfranc, must be chosen; but because Humbert left behind no writings which deal with this question, beyond the letter to Eusebius Bruno,[4] posterity has not dealt with him adequately.[5] In the literary controversy a more important rôle was occupied by Durand and Guitmund. Lanfranc's part in the councils which condemned Berengar appears to have been confined to the Councils of Rome and Vercelli (1050). We have no certain evidence of his attendance at any of the other councils or synods, and at Rome in 1050 he was cited rather as a defendant of his own orthodoxy than as counsel against Berengar. The importance of his action at Rome in 1050 has been overstressed in his own report.

---

[1] Migne, 150, 416d, 417a–c, 418a–b, 419c–d, 421d, 422c–d, 423c–d, 424c–d, 425b–c.

[2] *Ibid.* 416a, 419a, 425d, 429a–d.

[3] *Ibid.* 423b, 428b.

[4] *Ibid.* 425d.

[5] *Ibid.* cap. xviii.–xxiii.

[6] *Ibid.* 150, 432d, 433d, 434b–c, 437c–d, 440a, 441b–c, 442b–c.

[7] *Ibid.* 430d, 437a–b, 438d, 439a, 440c–d.

[8] *Ibid.* 438a.

[9] *Ibid.* 435b, 436d, 437c, 439d.

[10] *Ibid.* 434d, 435b.

[11] Schnitzer, p. 349, and Harnack, vi. 51 n. 5, hold that Lanfranc made little contribution to the doctrine. On p. 341 Schnitzer maintains that he did not attempt to meet Berengar's criticism that if a change of substance took place the accidents could not remain.

---

[1] Migne, 150, 411b–c. *Cf.* Sudendorf, p. 40, and D'Achery (Migne, 150, 15a–c). Lanfranc caused a number of documents, including the oaths of 1059 and 1079, to be collected. They are preserved in Trin. Coll. Camb. *MS. 405* (*cf.* Böhmer, *Die Fäls.*, p. 61 ff.).

[2] Bernold (Migne, 148, 1454b); Milo Crispin (Migne, 150, 37a); *Chron. Bec.* (Migne, 150, 643c); Orderic Vitalis (Le Prévost), ii. 211; Sigebert, *Chronica*; Auctuar. Ursicamp (*Mon. Ger. SS.*, vi. 471; Migne, 160, 583b); Malmesbury (*G.R.* 338); Anon. de Mœlk (Migne, 213, 979a); Honorius of Autun (Migne, 172, 231b); Higden, vii. 208, repeated verbatim by Henry of Knighton, p. 46; John Bromton (Twysden, p. 952). Schnitzer, p. 350 n. 3, says that Lanfranc's book was not used by his contemporaries. Its original form as a letter to Berengar certainly hindered its publicity at first, but it was widely read in the next generation.

[3] I see that the writer of the article in the *Rev. Bénédictine*, vi. (January 1889) 8, takes the same view.

[4] *Supra*, p. 84 f.

[5] *Cf.* my *Lanfranc*, pp. 51–55. Lanfranc's doctrine is discussed *infra*, p. 291 ff. On the *De Corpore*, *cf.* Sudendorf, pp. 39–47; Schnitzer, pp. 86–88, 340–350.

Soon after completing his treatise, Lanfranc left Caen for England (August 1070). The first eighteen months of his archiepiscopate were occupied by the dispute with Thomas, Archbishop of York, on the primacy question. In the midst of this, in 1071, he visited Alexander II at Rome, when the Pope referred the question back to an English council.[1] During this visit Lanfranc was the honoured guest of the Pope,[2] and the Berengarian controversy must have been discussed. If Alexander had not heard of Berengar's pamphlet, he would then learn about it from Lanfranc, and then, or later by letter, the Pope requested the Archbishop to send him a copy of his reply to Berengar. This was despatched in 1072,[3] together with a long letter reporting the issue of the primacy question in England. Bernold of Constance says that Alexander II wrote a friendly letter to Berengar, urging him to desist from his opinions, and to cease scandalising the Church.[4] This report has been discredited.[5] But Bernold had received the testimony of eye-witnesses and was a contemporary of Berengar, and was present at the Council of Rome in 1079,[6] and, although his account was influenced by Lanfranc's writings, it may well be accurate in this detail. It was probable that Alexander II would make some communication with Berengar, after the receipt of Lanfranc's treatise. No doubt Hildebrand's influence, which, after the death of Humbert, was supreme in Rome, tempered the effect of Lanfranc's book on the Pope's mind, but if Alexander had lived much longer, some modification of the friendly attitude which he had maintained towards Berengar must have followed. Alexander was Lanfranc's pupil and devoted friend, and the latter would not have rested content unless the Pope had altered his relationship with Berengar. From this check at the Curia, Berengar was saved by Hildebrand's accession to the papal chair on April 22, 1073.

---

[1] Macdonald, p. 84.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 81.

[3] Lanfranc, 'Epis. to Alexander II' (Giles, i. 27). De Crozals, p. 83, dates this letter 1070, and says that a later edition of Lanfranc's treatise was sent.

[4] *De Ber. Haer. Damn. Multiplici* (Migne, 148, 1456b).

[5] Bishop, p. 280. Schwabe, p. 103, thinks that Alexander knew of Berengar's attitude, but for politic reasons declined to rebuke him.

[6] *De Ber. Haer Damn. Multiplici* (Rieberer, xxi. 83; Migne, 148, 1467a).

In the meantime Berengar (1068–70) had written his famous reply to Lanfranc.[1] The existence of the *De Sacra Cœna*, was unsuspected until Lessing, in the year 1770, discovered it in the Royal Library of Wolfenbüttel in Brunswick. He first made known the discovery in a correspondence with Schmid, the editor of the 'Epistle of Adelmann to Berengar.'[1] Lessing's letters were afterwards published. They contained extracts from the *De Sacra Cœna*, but were neither accurate nor adequate. The publication of the whole of the MS. was projected by Stäudlin in 1814,[2] but was deferred by his death[3] until A. F. and F. Th. Vischer, under Neander's general editorship, published the work for the first time at Berlin in 1834.[4] No more important medieval discovery has been made in modern times, although further research has produced two collections of letters written by Berengar or his friends, or referring to him, published by Sudendorf (1850) and Edmund Bishop (1880). Until the *De Sacra Cœna* was discovered it was universally supposed that Berengar made no reply to Lanfranc's *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, and that Lanfranc's work was instrumental in bringing about a complete recantation of his teaching.

---

[1] An approximate date for the *De Sacra Cœna* may be secured on (i) internal and (ii) external grounds.

(i) (*a*) He uses the historic past tense for Humbert, so that the latter was dead when Berengar wrote. He died May 5, 1061.

(*b*) He does not refer to Lanfranc as Archbishop, but always as 'priest' and 'monk.' In other instances (*cf.* the case of the Bishops of Padua and Pisa, in the *Acta Concilii Romani*, 1078: Martène and Durand, iv. 104b) he loses no opportunity of abusing a bishop. Lanfranc became Archbishop in 1070. Schwabe, p. 114, cannot accept this argument.

(*c*) He does not allude to Hildebrand as Pope. Schwabe, p. 113, sees no difficulty here, and with Schnitzer, p. 89 n. 2, contends that the words 'sed quia adhuc superest Hildebrannus, qui de veritate consultus *tota dignitate* est adhuc respondere idoneus' (*D.S.C.*, p. 49), prove that Hildebrand possessed the papal dignity when Berengar wrote—a large conclusion on a slender foundation. Hildebrand became Pope in 1073.

(*d*) It makes no reference to any Council after 1059. So on internal grounds the book was written 1061–70.

(ii) (*a*) Berengar would hardly have written this lengthy work during the troubles of 1062–68.

(*b*) He wrote it after receiving the first edition of Lanfranc's book, which, in turn, was written 1066–68 (*supra*, p. 155 n. 2). If he had used a later edition he would have discussed the Roman Council of 1079, and although the end of the *D.S.C.* is missing, the historical survey is complete.

So the *De Sacra Cœna* was written 1068–70. In *Lanfranc*, p. 53, n. 4, I have suggested 1063–65 as the date.

Lessing, p. 65, dated it 1063–69, and is followed by Sudendorf, p. 47. Stäudlin, ii. 64, places it before 1073. Döllinger, i. 377, has *c.* 1070. The writer of the article in *The Christian Remembrancer* (1866), p. 355, gives 1063; Harnack, vi. 48, *c.* 1073. Schwabe, p. 113 f., inclines to a date after 1073, and is followed by Schnitzer, p. 89; Ébersolt, p. 146; and Hauck-Herzog, ii. 610.

Bröcking, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, xiii. 177 ff., dates it between January 1076 and the end of 1077 or beginning of 1078. His view is built up (1) on a statement of Berengar (*D.S.C.*, p. 41) that he knew the Bishops of Rennes and Limoges and the Abbot of Redon. His use of the preterite and pluperfect tenses ('erant' and 'egerant') proves that these prelates were dead when Berengar wrote. The last to die was the Bishop of Rennes, in January 1076, and therefore the book was not written before then.

(2) It is not likely that it would have been written after the Roman Council of 1079, nor between 1078 and 1079 when he was in Rome. He would not, otherwise, have missed inserting a report of the Council of 1078, which was so favourable to him. The book was written in France, and as he was in Rome by the end of 1077 or the beginning of 1078, that forms the latest date for the work.

But (1) an argument from the use of a tense is too slender, without further support, for fixing the 'terminus a quo.' Moreover, he might well have used the pluperfect if two of the three were dead.

(2) Bröcking has been misled by Berengar's statement in the *Acta*

Stäudlin attributed Lessing's MS. to Berengar himself.[5] The Vischers, on the contrary, assigned it to a scribe, copying with some additional notes of Berengar before him. The copyist omitted some passages of the original and inserted other passages erroneously.[6] Throughout the book, which contains some 266 octavo pages of type, the name of John the

---

Con. Rom. (Martène and Durand, iv. 103c) that he was in Rome about a year. The Register of Gregory's letters shows that Berengar did not go to Rome until the late summer or autumn of 1078 (*infra*, p. 184), and, if he stayed on, that was after the spring Council of 1079, because Gregory had not yet released him. So that on Bröcking's own argument the latest date should be the autumn of 1078.

However, it is entirely improbable that Berengar would have waited ten years before replying to Lanfranc's polemical treatise. Bröcking leaves out of account Berengar's omission to refer to Lanfranc as Archbishop (although he pays a high tribute to his learning), and to Hildebrand as Pope—two serious lacunae, since he lost no opportunity of speaking ill of dignities.

[1] Lessing, p. 1 ff.

[2] Vischer, Praef. (*D.S.C.*, p. 16).

[3] *Ibid.* p. 17.

[4] A new edition is badly needed, both on account of the scarcity of the book and the faulty editing of the Vischers. It was promised so long ago as 1913 (*cf.* de Ghellinck, *Rev. d'Hist. ecclés.*, xiv. (1913) 349 n. 1). An Appendix in MS. by Grotefend exists at Wolfenbüttel (*cf.* Alzog, ii. 441).

[5] Stäudlin, ii. 65. *Cf.* Vischer, p. 19.

[6] Vischer (*D.S.C.*), p. 22 f.

Scot has been erased, and the opening and concluding pages of the work are missing.[1] The punctuation is imperfect, and we cannot always rely on the reading of the text in the Vischerian edition, although Berengar's spelling is often archaic.[2] The MS. is probably an early and faulty copy of Berengar's original. It was necessary to revise the whole history of the controversy and of the history of eucharistic doctrine in the Middle Ages after the discovery of Berengar's work.

Schwabe suggests that Berengar answered seriatim Chapters I, II, and V of Lanfranc's *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, that the lost opening pages of the *De Sacra Cœna* contained the reply to the charge of perjury in Lanfranc's first chapter, and that the missing material is merely recapitulated in his reply to Chapters II and V.[3] Although Berengar's composition is confused and full of repetition,[4] a certain method is manifest throughout the work. In the first part of the book he usually requotes a passage from his earlier work, then quotes Lanfranc's comment, and follows this up with his own criticism. The clear delimitation of these three strands, in a new edition, would greatly facilitate the reading of the *De Sacra Cœna*, which is made more difficult and wearisome by Berengar's tortuously recapitulatory style. Some passages are almost untranslatable. The book doubtless reflects the haste and excitement of its author's mind. It suggests lack of control over thought and pen, characteristic of a tired and harassed brain. The untidy polemical sentences of the *De Sacra Cœna* are in complete contrast with the calm and dignified phrases of the letter to the hermits,[5] if that was written by him, although they resemble, in an exaggerated form, the tortuous Latin of his correspondence and of the *Acta Concilii Romani* (1078).

In its mutilated form the *De Sacra Cœna* begins with an attack upon Nicholas II for his lack of charity in not allowing Berengar a hearing.[6] Later on he accuses the Pope of levity, lack of learning, and undignified conduct,[1] and avers that he was better acquainted with the details of the Council of Rome (1059) than Lanfranc.[2] Much of the early part of the work is taken up with the refutation of Lanfranc's assertion that Berengar had wronged Humbert by attributing the oath of 1059 to the Cardinal rather than to Pope Nicholas, or the Council, or indeed to the churches which had received a copy of it! Humbert was the author of the document.[3] He was the blind leader of the blind who misled Nicholas. The Scripture saith 'Woe unto him through whom offence cometh!'[4] Humbert alone, without hearing Berengar, and without protracted and careful consideration, drew up the oath.[5] Although under fear of death he had taken the document in his hands,[6] he had not asked for it to be drawn up,[7] nor had he consented to it with his heart.[8] No one had asked him to do this.[9] The oath was not in any sense his, because he had not composed it.[10]

---

[1] Stäudlin, ii. 65 (Vischer, *D.S.C.*, p. 18).

[2] Vischer (*D.S.C.*), pp. 21, 23.

[3] P. 91.

[4] Cf. *D.S.C.*, pp. 26 f., 33 f., 41 f., 60 ff. He repeatedly uses the same words and phrases. They are collected by Schnitzer, p. 93 nn. 3–4.

[5] *Infra*, p. 204 ff.

[6] *D.S.C.*, pp. 25, 73 f. Will, ii. 50 ff., consistently declines Berengar's testimony in favour of Lanfranc's. Schwabe, pp. 77, 81, has emphasised the entire untrustworthiness of Will.

Berengar had stated in his earlier work that although Humbert was an enemy of truth, none the less was he a champion of truth.[11] In commenting on this statement Berengar now charges Lanfranc with twisting it round into an assertion that Berengar had stated as a general principle that every champion of truth is an enemy to truth. Berengar denies this and explains the meaning of his statement. Humbert was an enemy to truth because he alleged that the body of Christ was corruptible, and that the bread did not remain after consecration materially on the altar. On the contrary, he was also a champion of truth when he said that the body of Christ is the holy bread on the altar.[12] Even if Humbert's action had the consent of a large number of people, it does not follow that truth is on the side of the majority. In the time of Agrippinus, Bishop of Carthage, and in the time of Cyprian, the majority favoured the rebaptism of heretics.[13] The enemies of Caecilian were numerous at Carthage in the time of the Donatist controversy.[14]

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 71.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 72.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 25 f.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 26.
[5] *Ibid.* pp. 71, 80 f., 105.
[6] *Ibid.* pp. 26; *cf.* p. 60.
[7] *Ibid.* p. 71.
[8] *Ibid.* p. 25 f.
[9] *Ibid.* p. 26.
[10] *Ibid.* p. 106.
[11] Migne, 150, 412b.
[12] *D.S.C.*, p. 30 f.
[13] *Ibid.* pp. 27, 34, 39, 44, 48, 58.
[14] *Ibid.* pp. 34, 36.

Pope Liberius and the Bishops of Milan and Poitiers were exiled in the days of the Arian controversy—three bishops who maintained truth against a multitude of schismatics and heretics.[1]

To the charge of perjury Berengar replies: 'If I swore what I ought not to have sworn, and then, overcome by penitence, did not keep my oath, it was neither wise nor prudent to regard that as an execrable perjury. To swear what ought not to be sworn is to depart from God, to surrender a bad oath is to return to God. S. Peter, after he had sworn that he did not know Christ, could not have remained a disciple of Christ if he had persisted in his bad oath.' He continues, later on:

> Certainly, driven by fear of death, not being dealt with by Christian charity, I was able to swear something not in the name of the living God which was contrary to law and right, and fully repenting of this oath, I could break it, as it has not escaped your watchfulness. But that was not a base, but a virtuous and creditable action. It ought not to have been shameful, as you say, to read out what was handed to me, but rather, it was shameful not having refused what was to be handed to me, then to refuse it. I confess —apart from what is concerned with the oath, for there is nothing against me there—my sin to the Lord, that He may forgive my wickedness, so far as, being disturbed by fear of imminent death, I was silent on the truth, that I did not abhor casting the prophetical, gospel and apostolical writings into the fire. But who art thou, priest and monk, that doest business with me with no consideration for mercy? You, a priest, having seen me torn by robbers, and left half-dead, passed by on the other side, but God hath provided, since He did not leave me to the invective of thy righteousness. No less than against me is thy invective directed towards Aaron, the priest of the ancient people; towards Peter, the rock of the Church; towards Plato, the pearl of philosophy. . . . I beg that the bowels of mercy of all who chance to read this book may be extended towards me, not as a heretic, which you, by the mercy of God, lyingly ascribe to me, but because from fear of imminent death I kept silence from defending the truth, because at the order of the mob I threw prophetical, gospel and apostolic writings into the fire.[2]

Lanfranc's account of the Councils of Rome and Vercelli (1050) is recapitulated.[3] Berengar denies that the letter written by him to Lanfranc could have involved the latter in

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 55. [2] *Ibid.* pp. 60–63; *cf.* p. 74. [3] *Ibid.* p. 35 ff.

a suspicion of heresy, as Lanfranc alleged. Pope Leo's precipitation in condemning him unheard was really sacrilegious.[1] Gregory the Great had said: 'He deprives himself of the power of binding and loosing, who exercises it, not against the behaviour of his subordinates, but for the whims of his will.'[2] He ought to have waited until he was certain that Berengar deliberately refrained from answering his summons. His views on John the Scot and on Paschasius ought to have been examined orally, and his writings on the same should have been examined.[3] The value of Pope Leo's actions was proved by his attitude to the Bishop of Vercelli, who had outraged the betrothed bride of his uncle, a certain noble Pavian. Although this infamy was reported to Leo, the Pope sojourned with the Bishop.[4] He then records the incident of the reordination of the bishops.[5] If he had not appeared at Vercelli, that was not because his friends dissuaded him, for he had decided to come, but because Henry I had imprisoned him. This Leo knew at Vercelli, and he should have rebuked the King.[6] John the Scot's book was not fairly examined, but was summarily condemned at the instance of Peter, the deacon of the Roman Church.[7] Berengar's own views could not have been condemned at Vercelli, because he had not yet fully developed them.[8] The two clergy who intervened were not his clerks, and were hardly authorised to defend him.[9] They were apprehended by the Pope's order to save them from ill-treatment, and were not imprisoned, as Lanfranc had said.[10]

Lanfranc's statement that the legates of Pope Victor II condemned him at Tours was also quite wrong. Moreover, he had repeated the enormous lie that at Tours, as at Rome (1059), Berengar had sworn an oath. Hildebrand, who was famous for being transparently truthful, still lived, and could suitably reply to these statements.[11] After affirming that the

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, pp. 36 f., 42. *Cf.* 'Epis. of "P" to Berengar,' *supra*, p. 93 f.

[2] *D.S.C.*, p. 37. *Cf.* 'Epis. of Berengar to Joscelin' (Sudendorf, p. 233).

[3] *D.S.C.*, p. 37.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 39 f. Berengar may not have known that in the next year the Pope excommunicated the Bishop. *Supra*, p. 83 n. 1.

[5] *D.S.C.*, p. 41. *Supra*, p. 83 f.

[6] *D.S.C.*, p. 41 f.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 43; *cf.* p. 35 f.

[8] *Ibid.* p. 44.

[9] *Ibid.* p. 46 f.

[10] *Ibid.* p. 47 f.

[11] *Ibid.* p. 49 f.

Synod of Tours met in the time of Pope Leo and not in that of Pope Victor, he describes the proceedings of that gathering, and the abandonment of his project of going to Rome with the legate, when the news arrived of Leo's death. 'You will see how unworthily of your monkhood, how unworthily of your learning, your malice persuades you to write.'[1] He then returns to Pope Nicholas and the Roman Council of 1059,[2] and passes on to a long and involved discussion of the doctrinal aspects of the dispute.[3]

This trenchant refutation of Lanfranc's statements is accompanied by language which treats the Popes with scant respect. He alludes to 'that Leo'[4] and 'thy Leo,'[5] 'that Nicholas'[6] with the same scorn as 'thy Humbert'[7] and 'that Humbert.'[8] He would not call Leo holy, certainly not a lion of the tribe of Judah. The words 'Ye are of your father, the devil,' applied to him. He had not found him to be an honest man.[9] He speaks with opprobrium of the Church as 'a crowd of simpletons,'[10] the Roman Council is 'a Council of vanity,'[11] 'a blind leader of the blind,'[12] 'a flock of illiterates,'[13] and the bishops and abbots come under the lash of his invective. The uncanonical election of the bishops and abbots is an indication of their worthlessness,[14] and he bewailed the days of the Church's infancy, when elections to bishoprics and abbeys were canonically made, and good men were appointed.[15] This is the only reference in all his writings to the burning question of lay-investitures, which was soon to involve Church and State, from Pope and Emperor downwards, in an internecine strife.

But to suggest that Berengar was attempting to define the nature of ecclesiastical and spiritual authority in new terms [1] is to read back into his day the thought of much later times. His criticisms are the ebullitions of an agitated mind striking indiscriminately at all who attacked him, whether Pope or Bishop, Church or Council. If he occasionally gave expression to curious views such as his contention that separation from the Sacrament of the Altar did not deprive a man from communion with the Church, since communion refers to right belief and a moral life,[2] while participation in the sacraments is 'communication' and not communion, it is but an indication of his use of the rational faculty for the explanation of difficulties, and in this instance, no doubt, in order to surmount the awkwardness of his own position as a churchman who had formerly been barred out by authority from the Church's altars. His final standard of appeal on controversial matters lay with the rational interpretation of Scripture,[3] but he scarcely develops the idea to the exclusion of the functions of Pope or Bishop or Church as centres of authority. He rather condemns specific individuals on the papal chair and in the episcopate and Church. While appealing to the authority of Scripture,[4] he also admits that of tradition [5] and the Church,[6] and his defence of papal revenues shows that he had no desire to see the papal dignity abolished.[7] His dispute lay not with authority itself, but with the interpretation placed by authority on Scripture and the patristic writings. It was the function of authority to supply a proper and adequate exegesis.[8]

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 50 ff.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 70–75.

[3] This is summarised *infra*, p. 300 ff.

[4] *D.S.C.*, pp. 37, 39, 41, 42, 47 f.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 36.

[6] *Ibid.* pp. 26, 71.

[7] *Ibid.* pp. 81, 85, 86, 88.

[8] *Ibid.* pp. 31, 46, 66, 69, 71, 87.

[9] *Ibid.* p. 34.

[10] *Ibid.* pp. 35, 44, 54, 116.

[11] *Ibid.* p. 43. The same expression was used by Herrand, Bishop of Halberstadt, *c.* 1095 (*cf.* Carlyle, iii. 133). It is a quotation from the Vulgate of Psa. xxv. 4–5; *cf.* xxi. 17.

[12] *D.S.C.*, pp. 44, 63, 65, 71.

[13] *Ibid.* p. 74. Hauck-Herzog, ii. 611, suggests that Berengar did not criticise general councils but only local councils.

[14] *D.S.C.*, p. 63.

[15] *Ibid.* p. 58 f.

Under his rebuke fell scholars like Paschasius Radbert [9] and politicians like Humbert.[10] Lanfranc, from whose learning he expected better treatment, is chastised with abuse, but Berengar was only replying in the same tone that Lanfranc had used.[1] Although Humbert is dealt with severely, Lanfranc was the chief object of his wrath in the *De Sacra Cœna.* As the book advances, the bitter scorn poured upon this 'monk,' who was untrue to his learning, became more and more frequent.[2] Lanfranc showed that his heart was not well disposed towards Berengar.[3] He acted from envy and hate.[4] His dark mind could not comprehend the true light, for despising others, he thought that he alone was wise, vapouring in his thoughts things which were foolish in the sight of God.[5] It was not wonderful if others less learned than he should take upon themselves, under the impulse of envy and hate, the liberty to lie.[6] 'The continual falsehood of thy treatise compels me to go on at length, whether I will or not.'[7] Lanfranc acted contrary to the evidence of things and against his own conscience.[8] On account of his malice he was blinded by the judgment of God.[9] He distorted holy Scripture.[10] He and Paschasius cast stones at the truth.[11] His views were the effect of delirium. He stood convicted by his own writings,[12] and Berengar claims to have confuted him.[13] The truth of his doctrine an idiot or a blind man could see, much more a learned man like Lanfranc.[14] 'A light had shined in the darkness and Lanfranc had comprehended it not.'[15] That was his final reply to the trumpet-call with which Lanfranc had closed the *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*—'False therefore is that which is believed and constructed by thee concerning the body of Christ, for His flesh which we receive is true, and true is His blood which we drink.'[16]

---

[1] Reuter, i. 108, 117, 121; Faivre, pp. 18–21; Ébersolt, p. 163 ff.

[2] *D.S.C.*, p. 38, with marginal note.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 100 f.

[4] *Ibid.* pp. 96, 100.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 183: 'nulla me unquam contra veritatem catholicam confinxisse, nulla depravasse scriptuarum loca. . . .'

[6] *Ibid.* p. 198.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 273.

[8] I see that Endres (*Görresgesellschaft Phil. Jahrbuch*, xxvi. 169) adopts a similar view. Berengar did not criticise the whole of dogma, nor attack the current idea of authority generally.

[9] *D.S.C.*, pp. 33, 35, 37, 53 f., 65, 68, 81, 84, 174, 182, 220, 222, 281.

[10] *Ibid.* pp. 25 f., 29–32, 41, 46, 64 f., 68–71, 80–82, 86–88, 105–108, 114–116, 121–123.

The greater part of the work is occupied by a refutation of the orthodox doctrine of the Eucharist, and with the unfolding of his own teaching. If in his polemic he loses no opportunity of referring to classical authors, or to incidents in classical history,[1] so in his doctrinal disquisition he constantly quotes and comments on the writings of the Fathers. Of these quotations by far the larger number are taken from the works of Augustine and Ambrose, or writings attributed to them in that day. Ambrose receives more attention, especially in the latter half of the book, where he develops his own views,[2] an interesting feature, because the Berengarian teaching is a development of that of Augustinian symbolism, not Ambrosian realism; but he struggles to secure Ambrose for his case. Quotations from Origen,[3] Cyprian,[4] Hilary,[5] Jerome,[6] Leo the Great,[7] Gregory the Great,[8] Faustus of Riez[9] are to be found, and reference is made to Agrippinus[10] and Caecilian[11] of Carthage, Popes Melchiades,[12] Liberius,[13] and Hormisdas,[14] and Fulbert of Chartres.[15] The *De Sacra Cœna*, like Berengar's letters, is full of quotations from Scripture, which he frequently applies with success to his adversaries' arguments, and the recital of Old Testament incidents occupies a prominent place in his illustrations. If the charge that he was once unlearned in the Scriptures was ever justified, he had long ago overcome it.

---

[1] Migne, 150, 414b–c, 415c–d, 418b, 419b, etc.

[2] *D.S.C.*, pp. 25, 27, 33, 35, 53 f., 63, 165, 171, 190 f., 220–222, 230 f., 235 f., 238, 256, 259, 260–263, 274–278, 280 f., 283, 285 f.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 27.

[4] *Ibid.* pp. 30, 41, 48, 53, 112.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 28.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 46.

[7] *Ibid.* pp. 49, 53, 140.

[8] *Ibid.* p. 58.

[9] *Ibid.* pp. 256, 259.

[10] *Ibid.* p. 205.

[11] *Ibid.* p. 220.

[12] *Ibid.* p. 247.

[13] *Ibid.* pp. 235, 275, 277.

[14] *Ibid.* p. 280.

[15] *Ibid.* pp. 28, 116, 207, 281.

[16] Migne, 150, 442d.

It is doubtful whether the existence of Berengar's book was known in his own lifetime. It is not mentioned in the revised edition of the *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, which Lanfranc issued after 1079, nor by Guitmund, Archbishop of Aversa, nor by the numerous writers on the orthodox side who took up the literary controversy after Gregory VII had settled the dispute. Yet if our MS. is not Berengar's original, the work must have had some limited circulation. Probably it was known only to his friends, and if in later years most of the copies were destroyed by authority, the copy which has come down to us with beginning and ending torn away, and the name of John the Scot everywhere erased, was probably mutilated by a friendly hand in order to preserve it from destruction.

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, pp. 25, 29, 33, 48, 61, 63, 100, 183 f., 213 f., 260, 271.

[2] The references are too numerous to quote. Ambrose is quoted on about 120 pages, and Augustine on about 90 pages.

[3] *D.S.C.*, p. 270: 'Agnoscite, quia figurae sunt, etc. . . .'—a quotation which he wrongly assigns to Jerome.

[4] *Ibid.* pp. 27, 34, 39, 44, 48, 58, 86, 178.

[5] *Ibid.* pp. 238, 275.

[6] *Ibid.* pp. 36, 38, 237, 269, 276.

[7] *Ibid.* pp. 274–276.

[8] *Ibid.* pp. 37, 50, 61, 193, 275 f., 289.

[9] *Ibid.* p. 90 (wrongly attributed to Eusebius of Emesa).

[10] *Ibid.* pp. 27, 34, 39, 44, 48, 58.

[11] *Ibid.* p. 34.

[12] *Ibid.* p. 46.

[13] *Ibid.* pp. 55, 115.

[14] *Ibid.* p. 289.

[15] *Ibid.* p. 98.

About 1075 [1] appeared an equally extensive work on the Eucharist from the pen of Guitmund.[2] This writer was an old pupil of Lanfranc at Bec, who became a monk at Lefroy in Normandy. He travelled to England, where he refused an English bishopric from the hands of William, because he could not condone the slaughter entailed by the Conquest.[3] In 1079 he declined the archbishopric of Rouen on the same grounds, and passed on to Italy, where Gregory VII nominated him to the college of Roman cardinals, and Urban II made him Archbishop of Aversa. His work, the *De Corporis et Sanguinis Christi Veritate in Eucharistica*,[4] was written in Normandy before his departure for Rome.[5] The first two books are in the form of a dialogue between Guitmund and another monk named Roger on the main points of the Berengarian teaching. In the third book he deals with some additional matter, notably the theory of impanation.[6] At the beginning of the dialogue he draws attention to four types of Berengarianism.[7] His wide travels gave him ample opportunity of estimating and comparing the results of Berengar's teaching, although he writes with a strong bias against Berengar, yet without the acrimonious tone of Lanfranc. The work is of less value than that of Durand and Lanfranc for the history of the controversy,[8] although he makes some interesting references to Berengar's early life,[1] but as a contribution to the development of eucharistic doctrine it far outweighs those of the other two writers. Its appearance may have influenced the Papacy to institute the final examination of Berengar's case at Rome in 1078–79, for Guitmund was in favour with the Curia. The use of the term ' substantialiter ' in the definition of belief submitted to Berengar at Rome (1079)[2] was probably inspired by Guitmund's work. He attacks Berengar on his own ground, making use of dialectical methods, without the excuse put forward by Lanfranc. But, if his book is written without the acrimonious abuse in which Lanfranc indulged, it is not always fair to Berengar.[3] For example, it accuses Berengar of refusing the evidence of miracles,[4] especially the report that after the Resurrection Christ passed through closed doors,[5] whereas the objection raised by the Scolasticus was against the legends which were derived from Gregory the Great and other writers, and his constant quotation of Old Testament miracles[6] supplies an easy refutation of the accusation of Guitmund.

---

[1] Sudendorf, p. 53, dated it *c.* 1076; Le Prévost (Orderic Vitalis, ii. 227 n. 1) *c.* 1075; the *Hist. Litt.*, viii. 563, gives 1075 or 1076. The date is fixed roughly by its reference to Hildebrand as 'Gregory VII,' and so it was not written before 1073. It does not refer to the Roman Councils of 1078–79. It thus falls between 1073 and 1078. The allusion to Berengar as an aged man (Hurter, xxxviii. 112) supports the approximate date 1075 for its composition.

[2] Bernold, *De Ber. Haer. Damn. Mult. Tract.* (Migne, 148, 1456b), calls him Christianus, a name given to him also by Paul Bernriedensis (*ibid.* 1452c–d).

[3] Orderic Vitalis (Le Prévost, ii. 227 f.).

[4] Hurter, xxxviii.; Migne, 149, 1427–1494.

[5] Alberic of the Three Fountains (Bouq., xi. 354d).

[6] Hurter, xxxviii. 158 ff.

[7] *Ibid.* 12 f.

[8] *Ibid.* 164; *cf.* 130.

The account of the literary activity of this period may be closed by a glance at the long epistle of Wolfelm, Abbot of Brauweiler, to Meginhard, Abbot of Münschengladbach.[7] Wolfelm refers to the harm which ' a certain drunkenness, the heresy of Berengar,' is doing. ' Let us decline the danger of this inebriation and apply to the breasts for better wine.' He discusses the statement which denied that after the Resurrection Christ passed through closed doors, and contrasts the alleged teaching of Berengar and S. John on this point. Then he deals with Berengar's teaching on the Eucharist, which he describes as ' a blasphemy,' and ' the poison of a gushing stream.' Berengar looks at the Sacrament with the eyes of the body and not of the mind.[1]

---

[1] Hurter, xxxviii. 7 ff.

[2] *Infra*, p. 192.

[3] *Cf.* Stäudlin, ii. 11 f. ; Neander, vi. 341 ; Sudendorf, p. 54 ; Reuter, i. 90 ; Schnitzer, p. 96.

[4] Hurter, xxxviii. 144 f.

[5] *Ibid.* 147.

[6] *D.S.C.*, pp. 91, 94, 149, 160, 163, 200, 217 (the rod of Moses) ; 94, 181 (Lot's wife) ; 96, 127, 151 f., 158, 172, 204 f. (Naaman) ; 149 (manna) ; 149, 164 (Nile water) ; 141 (Elisha and the axe).

[7] *Mon. Ger. SS.*, xii. 185 ff. ; Migne, 154, 412b ff. ; Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. ii. 681 ff. Sudendorf, p. 54 f., dates the letter 1076–79. Schnitzer, p. 89, has 1073–78. Sudendorf suggests that the reference to Berengar's alleged denial that the Resurrection body of Christ could pass through closed doors is taken from Guitmund's work. But this is not proved, for, as Schnitzer shows (p. 83 n. 3), Guitmund may have borrowed from Wolfelm. Moreover, Eusebius Bruno also appears to assign this teaching to Berengar (Migne, 147, 1203b).

---

[1] *Mon. Ger. SS.*, xii. 185. *Cf. infra*, p. 216 f.

CHAPTER X

GREGORY VII AND THE ROMAN COUNCILS (1078–79)

On April 21, 1073, Alexander II died, and on the next day, before the funeral services were over, the crowd from the city invaded the Lateran, shouting for Hildebrand to be Pope. Hildebrand tried to calm the multitude, but he was put aside by Cardinal Hugh, who addressed the people and proposed the election of Hildebrand. The unanimous shout of cardinals, clergy, and people overcame the protests of Hildebrand at the nature of the proceedings, and he was hurried to the Church of S. Pietro in Vincoli, where the election was formally confirmed.[1] No such enthusiasm and unanimity had ever before marked the elevation of a Roman bishop, and a parallel is to be sought in the election of Ambrose at Milan, when the popular will obtained the consecration of the Consular of Liguria and Aemilia, but no better choice could have been made than of him who for twenty years and more had been the safest brain and surest hand behind the politics of the Curia.

When Alexander II died, the clouds were again threatening to gather over Berengar. We have seen that the Pope was beginning to become uneasy. The generous but wise friendship shown by him towards Berengar had not been met by restraint and submission on the side of the Scolasticus. If the waning support of his friends in Anjou had foreshortened the opportunity for an active propaganda from his archidiaconal stall at Angers, and from his lecture-room at Tours, Berengar had taken up the formal defence and propagation of his eucharistic teaching by entering into a literary contest with the orthodox leaders of the day. At first he concentrated his criticism upon Leo IX and Humbert, but when Lanfranc defended the Pope and Cardinal, Berengar widened his attack and included the Abbot of Caen and Nicholas II within his strictures.

---

[1] W. R. W. Stephens, *Hildebrand and his Times* (1903), p. 89 f.

Quite early in his pontificate Gregory VII found it necessary to warn Berengar to remain quietly at Angers, to be silent under attack, and not to discuss the question until an opportunity was provided of doing so before the Pope.[1] Was Berengar beginning to take up the defence of his views by visiting other places, or did Gregory wish him to discontinue his lectures at Tours? It is clear that conditions at Angers were now sufficiently favourable to permit a quiet retreat there for Berengar, if he had desired it. Fulk of Anjou had not yet taken up his brother's hostility towards him.

At this time one of the earlier symptoms of the dispute reappeared. There was for a moment a danger lest the cause of Berengar should again be adopted by the civil authorities. Philip of France was drawing the attention of the Curia more and more upon himself, by outraging public feeling and by breaches of Church law. He was gluttonous and lazy, but the free use which he made of his marriage vows drew rebuke after rebuke upon him until he was finally excommunicated at the Council of Clermont (1094) by Urban II, where Berengar's teaching was also condemned.[2] The King endeavoured to secure the support of Berengar,[3] who, in the dispute over the appointment of Radulf to the archbishopric of Tours, was really one of Philip's opponents. But enemies often draw together under the stress of a common affliction, especially if it arises from the same source. In the royal action we may see an indication that Philip was aware that Berengar was again losing ground with the Curia,[4] and that his following in Anjou and Touraine was again growing. Philip would not have applied to an isolated heresiarch. But Berengar himself removed any anxiety that a new political complication was about to spring from the eucharistic controversy. He replied to the King at length, but definitely upheld the Church's attitude on the points raised by Philip. He declined to be drawn into a discussion on the theory of the Eucharist, and warned the King against continuing in his misdeeds. He also made use of the opportunity to rebuke the royal action concerning the archbishopric of Tours.

---

[1] 'Epis. of Berengar to Gregory VII' (Sudendorf, p. 231, dated 1077; *ibid.* p. 183): 'voluntatem tuam in eo fuisse multo ante tempore, ut juberes, me perdurandum clericum Andeḡ ponere custodiam ori meo et silere etiam a bonis, si consisteret peccator adversum me.'

[2] Sudendorf, p. 173 ff.

[3] 'Epis. of Berengar to Philip' (Sudendorf, p. 228).

[4] Schnitzer, p. 94.

> The words of the apostle are 'Let a brother remain in the vocation to which he is called.' God has called you to direct the government of the kingdom. On what you ought to do in this matter your coronation oath was not silent. If you have kept this oath inviolate from that time, you will at length obtain a peaceful kingdom and renown. For the rest certain are not silent that the royal dignity ought to devote greater attention to the Lord's Table, more application to the fulfilment of righteousness, more joyfulness in giving alms, more recourse to the Church at the regular hours of prayer. . . . Concerning the practice of righteousness, what pertains to the King's person, pertains to his dignity. As for works of charity to be cheerfully done, that concerns not only the royal sublimity, but all those who, at the judgment day, are to be placed on the right hand. The Lord Himself teacheth saying, 'When the Son of Man cometh He will say, Come, ye blessed children of my Father: . . . I was hungry and ye fed me.' . . . As to other works of mercy the King's watchfulness should study this, that he ought to do more who has received more from the Lord. . . . As for prayer, we have the prescript of the Lord . . . and the gospels advocate short prayers. Augustine says that in the primitive Church, people went morning and evening to church, and that the Egyptian hermits used ejaculatory prayer. . . . Prayer is not to be urged against the claims of other good works, a maxim especially applicable to kings, and all who assist in the administration. But monks and canons are to persevere in the rule which they have chosen. I intended later to deal with my first point which concerned partaking of the Sacrament of the Lord's Table. The Lord says 'He who eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me, and I in him,' and the apostle says 'Let a man prove himself, and then eat of that bread and drink that cup. He who eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh condemnation to himself.' Augustine says 'Remembering your stations and maintaining your vows, approach the flesh and blood of the Lord. But if a man knows himself to be otherwise let him not come.' . . . As to relations with women at festival seasons, he says 'No one wants to come to church in a soiled garment, then why has he boldness to approach the altar with a soul besmirched by wantonness? If one ought to blush to touch the Eucharist with soiled hands, how much more to receive it with a polluted soul.' Hilary says that infirm souls, grown old in sin, cannot receive the

Sacraments of the new grace, for the rent becomes worse, the new wine and the old bottles perish. The reason is twofold, for because of the age of their sins, they cannot bear the virtue of the new grace. Cyprian says that no sinner ought to arrogate to himself the authority or use of the Sacraments. Jerome says 'Woe to the evil man who approaches the Table of the Lord, who, with a mind full of craft, with a heart besmirched with filth, does not fear to share in the holy oblations of the mysteries of Christ.' Augustine draws a distinction shewing that those who are under penance for crimes, of whom the apostle says 'Those who act thus do not attain to the Kingdom of God,' do not approach the Lord's Table . . . as much as those who for crimes should not cease rigorously offering sacrifices of alms, fasting, and prayers themselves, and supplications. Concerning those who think a man ought to communicate frequently, even daily, and those who think less frequently, though both act legitimately, Augustine thus states the case. . . . On the contrary someone may say that if the wound of sin is so great that such medicines are to be postponed, each ought to be removed from the altar by the authority of the bishop, lest each freely comes or stays away at his own will. . . . Perchance he decides more correctly between them who advises that each shall above all remain in the peace of Christ, and that each shall do according to what he faithfully believes he ought. I apologise for the prolixity of my letter, but the royal commands are responsible for this. I am coming to the end. I will tell you the words of Augustine. He said to Boniface, a Roman Count, 'May conjugal modesty, sobriety and frugality adorn your behaviour. To act well and not to abstain from unlawful things is a conspiracy of error. . . . You complain of the heavy fight.' . . . Take arms in your hands, let prayer smite the ears of your Maker, for when fighting occurs, God, having opened the heavens, sees, and gives a righteous victory to the side at which He looks. Rule justly, claim nothing in your own strength, boast rather in the Author of virtues, and you will fear no enemy. Farewell! May God long preserve your royal dignity for our solace and consolation, devoted to prayer so long as other good actions are not neglected, communicating in the Sacrament of the Altar on the fixed solemn and festival days, so far as the aforesaid causes do not prevent you, and taking care to perform adequately works of mercy to the utmost, and to do justice, and in this way concerning the sacrilege against the Church of the blessed Martin, exercise the rigour of the royal censure, delaying not at all to the honour of Christ and so great a Confessor.[1]

This admirable epistle is full of the same large-hearted wisdom which appears in the letter to the hermits.[2] Avoiding bald and crude allusions to the royal misdeeds, he makes quite clear his disapproval of the King's actions. Religious duties are not to be neglected, but they are not to be overdone, and full allowance is made for the busy preoccupations of a king's life. The wise admonitions concerning prayer and attendance at the Eucharist might have been given by a prudent and sympathetic modern bishop to an administrator immersed in the duties of office.

---

[1] Sudendorf, pp. 225–229, written in 1074. *Cf.* pp. 172 ff.

[2] *Infra*, p. 204 ff.

The refusal of Berengar to lower the standards of the Church, or to be drawn into a political union against the Papacy,[1] did not prevent a renewal of synodical action against himself. At Poitiers, on January 13, 1076,[2] the legate Gerald held a synod at which the Berengarian question was again handled. The turbulent outbursts which necessitated the intervention of Leo IX on behalf of Berengar's supporters at Vercelli in 1050, and the intervention of Eusebius Bruno at Tours in 1054, were repeated. But on this occasion Berengar was nearly killed. Not only did he give offence by his teaching on the Eucharist; he appears to have criticised the doctrine of Hilary, the great Saint of Poitiers, on faith and on the person of Christ.[3]

An echo of this incident probably appears in the letter which Berengar about this time sent to Herman, Bishop of Metz, one of the supporters of Gregory VII against the

---

[1] Gfrörer, *Greg. VII*, i. 602, says that at this date the dispute had lost its political character. But in vii. 681 f. he says that Philip I desired to revive his father's plans. Gregory summoned Berengar, Philip's instrument, to Rome, and checked the scheme by silencing him there.

[2] The *Chron. S. Maxentii* or *Malleacensis* (Marchegay and Mabille, p. 406; Bouq., xii. 401a) dates this Council 1075, and is followed by Schwabe, p. 111 n. 1; Mansi, xx. 449; and Schnitzer, p. 96 (followed by Ébersolt, p. 150) dates it January 1076, on the French reckoning. The *Chron. S. Maxentii* reports two councils at Poitiers for this year—one held by Joscelin, Archbishop of Bordeaux, on June 25, 1075, which did not deal with the case of Berengar (Sudendorf, p. 180), followed by another council held by Gerald in the ensuing January (cf. *Gall. Christ.*, ii. 804b). Sudendorf, p. 50, places Gerald's council in January 1074, on the ground that in the Register of Gregory VII's letters, Gerald appears as legate in France only in 1073 and 1074. But the names for the legates of 1075 are not given in the Register, although we know that they were expected in France in the autumn of 1075 (*cf.* Jaffé, *Mon. Greg.*, p. 177). The legate for 1076 was Hubert (Jaffé, p. 255). In the absence of other evidence we may follow the account of the *Chron. S. Maxentii* and conclude that Gerald's commission extended to January 1076 (on our reckoning).

[3] *Cf.* 'Epis.' of Lanfranc to Reginald, Sweyn, and Henry, three clergy of Poitiers (Migne, 150, 543c ff.). *Infra*, p. 180.

Emperor Henry IV. Herman had sent a consolatory letter to Berengar and confided one of his clergy to Berengar's care. Berengar sends his greeting to Herman and the clergy of Metz and continues :

> I rejoice in God's propitious comfort shewn to me in the arrival of your letter. He strikes and heals, annoying me with the endless disturbance of envious men, but none the less not disdaining to soften it, by the favour of your kind love for me. It is only your kind love which causes your eminence to write to me, for I was never, nor ever shall be worthy of such notice. Who indeed am I to whom you ascribe the treasures of wisdom ? You should rather have dealt with me as a sinner. I have received brother Peter, son of your love dear Father, willingly. Gladly do I see him. It will be for you to secure the help of the almighty power of the Lord Jesus, in order to make your decision to send him to me, fruitful both to him and to me.[1]

If the complaint made by Reginald, Abbot of Poitiers, to Lanfranc, now Archbishop of Canterbury, against Berengar refers to words spoken by Berengar at the Synod of Poitiers, the long reply of Lanfranc to Reginald, Sweyn,[2] and Henry may be dated 1076.[3] Lanfranc acknowledges the receipt of the Abbot's letter, and disapproves of his intention to visit England, on account of the long journey and perils by land and water, and continues :

> Since that schismatic—I mean Berengar—as your letter testified, constantly asserts that the blessed Hilary, formerly Bishop of your city and people, teaches wrongly in his book on Faith, and puts forth unlikely opinions about the Lord Jesus Christ, in his book on the divine Trinity, your blessedness ought not to wonder that he, who is reported by the truest accounts to believe and teach so many and such evil things concerning the Head himself—who is reported to speak equally evilly of a member of the Head, is delivered by God's judgment to a reprobate mind. Truly, whoever attaches the stigma of a heresy to Hilary, involves in the stain of the same error many orthodox leaders, who have extolled him with great praise.[4]

---

[1] Sudendorf, p. 229. He dates it 1074 or 1075 (p. 176 f.) on his contention that the Synod of Poitiers was held in 1074. On the same argument the letter may be dated in 1076 (*supra*, p. 179 n. 2).

[2] Seutunus = Sewinus (Mabillon, *Annales*, v. 57 f.).

[3] Sudendorf, p. 49 f., dates it *c.* 1073, but if it is connected with the Synod of Poitiers, as he thinks (p. 50), it should be dated 1076.

[4] Migne, 150, 543d–e.

The disputed teaching arose from a somewhat obscure passage in Hilary's work on the Trinity, in which Hilary maintained that although the body of Jesus received the blows of the Passion, it did not suffer pain, but was impervious like water, fire, or air when smitten by a javelin. The strength of the body received the violence of the pain raging against it without the sense of pain.[1] In defence of Hilary's view Lanfranc appealed to the theory of the hypostatic union, and contended that Hilary meant that the human body of Jesus received and felt the blows, which the divinity in Him could not feel.[2] Probably Berengar was attempting to draw a similar distinction, in opposition to the crude theological notions of the age.[3] The absence of any reference to the eucharistic question in Lanfranc's letter suggests that Berengar had publicly raised a new topic of discussion, or that he was obeying the injunction of Gregory VII to leave the subject alone.[4] On the other hand, the absence of any reference to questions apart from the Eucharist, in the only account we have of the Synod of Poitiers, was due either to the fact that Berengar expressed himself vaguely on Hilary's doctrine, or that he was not understood, or again, that the minds of the authorities were too much occupied with the eucharistic question to associate Berengar with anything else at the time, and if Berengar confined himself to obscure passages like that quoted by Lanfranc, the more moderate minds among the leading churchmen may have felt that such questions were better left alone.

In 1076 Joscelin of Bordeaux was suspended from his archbishopric by the legate Hugo, and in the following year from his priesthood. Three letters of Berengar to Joscelin have survived,[5] and the Scolasticus made use of an opportunity, probably between the two condemnations of the Archbishop, to send him a letter of condolence:[6]

> I would have sympathetically condoled with you in the misfortune which recently disturbed you overmuch perhaps, save that I remembered the consolation for both of us in the words

---

[1] Migne, 150, 544c. [2] *Ibid.* 545b. [3] *Infra*, p. 217.
[4] *Supra*, p. 176. [5] Sudendorf, pp. 200, 230, 232.
[6] *Ibid.* p. 230, dated 1076–77 (*ibid.* p. 180).

'Everything worketh together for good to them who love God.' May the love of God, whose scourge is never unjust, and profits him who returns to His heart, work patience in you out of tribulation, so that neither cast down by adversity, nor puffed up by prosperity, you may receive the solace due to the faithful. . . . For the rest, as our fellow Canon F. discussed with you, you should shew me what ideas and aims you have formed. . . .

Gregory's earlier order to Berengar not to discuss the Eucharist publicly was repeated to him by Eusebius, Bishop of Angers, and Quiriacus, Bishop of Nantes, when they were returning to France after a visit to Rome.[1] According to Berengar's own statement he faithfully obeyed the papal wishes,[2] but he was disturbed by the action of the legate Hugh, Bishop of Die, who, ignoring the fact that Berengar was under Gregory's protection, began to institute proceedings against him in Rome, and possibly attempted to secure his removal from Angers.[3] Berengar was summoned to attend a council, possibly that of Autun[4] (September 17, 1077), but he refused to go, because he distrusted the bishops, and appealed to the Pope. Hugh was checked by a papal letter, which Berengar gratefully acknowledged in his communication to Gregory in 1077. At the same time he begged the Pope to allow him to come to Rome in order to present his case in person.

With very great reverence to Pope Gregory in the Lord Jesus, greetings of all pure love from Berengar. Hearing of your letter to Hugh, Bishop of Die, on my behalf, I have offered no small thanks to God, the guardian of the poor, and to thy paternity, O best of fathers! I greatly marvelled that those who came to us from your authority knew not that it had been your will since a long time ago, that I should remain quietly at Angers, and be silent even from righteous speech, if a sinner should rise against me. I have obeyed your order so far as it behoved me, and have resolved to do nothing further in that matter, unless I can do so in your hearing alone; waiting for an opportunity from the Guide and Lord of all for seeing and hearing you. This same expression of your will the Lord Bishop of Angers and the Bishop of Nantes brought to me, when they returned from Rome. Best of fathers, human and divine laws demand that judges who are suspected to be adverse and hostile are to be refused. The divine law also says that the word of a man of contemptible life is to be held contemptible.[1] They who do not follow divine commands, lose the weight of their own human testimony. Concerning this I beseech thee that thy Christianity may grant me freedom to avoid throwing myself before savage men as before wild beasts. Best of fathers, may thy Christianity for long flourish to give to my obscurity the worthy patronage of the apostolical chair.[2]

---

[1] 'Epis. of Berengar to Gregory VII' (Sudendorf, p. 231). Sudendorf, p. 184, confuses this embassy with that of Rahard and Quiriacus, in the time of Alexander II (Sudendorf, p. 169; *cf. supra*, p. 143. But Sudendorf, of course, was not aware of the existence of the letter discovered by Bishop). Schnitzer, p. 98, thinks that Gregory's order to Berengar was conveyed for the first time by the two Bishops. Schwabe, p. 121 n. 4, distinguishes between the issue of the order and its confirmation.

[2] 'Epis. of Berengar to Gregory VII' (Sudendorf, p. 231).

[3] Sudendorf, p. 184, and Schnitzer, p. 98, report that Hugh was ignorant of the Pope's original injunction. Berengar's statement certainly bears this interpretation ('ignorare eos, qui ab auctoritate tua ad nos deveniunt voluntatem tuam,' etc.: Sudendorf, p. 231). But it is very improbable, and is contradicted by the statement 'multo ante tempore.' These writers also say that Hugh attempted to secure his suspension and removal from Angers. This is probably the meaning behind Berengar's complaint to Gregory.

[4] Sudendorf, p. 184.

Gregory probably desired the whole matter to be allowed to rest, and it is very unlikely that he had ordered an inquiry to be held by Hugh of Die in France.[3] But the dispute was again becoming unmanageable in that region. The elaborate treatise of Guitmund had appeared in Normandy, the clergy were clamouring for another synod, and the legate desired the same. After the return of Hugh, Bishop of Die, to Rome, Hugh, Abbot of Cluny, acted as legate.[4] Gregory received a letter from him asking for instructions on the Berengarian question.[5] On May 8, 1078, the Pope replied in the course of a letter concerned with the appointment of an abbot as bishop at the request of the King of Spain. Gregory said that Hugh's messengers, Cardinal Richard, the legate for

---

[1] Sudendorf, p. 181 (*cf.* p. 184), quoting his *Registrum oder merkwürdige Urkunde*, i. (1849) 13 ff., shows that Hugh associated with evil companions.

[2] Sudendorf, p. 230 f., date 1077 (*ibid.* pp. 182–186), probably written in the late autumn. *Cf. infra*, p. 184 n. 6.

[3] Sudendorf, p. 184, and Schnitzer, p. 98, contend that Hugh of Die was authorised to summon Berengar before a French synod. The epistle of Berengar (Sudendorf, p. 230 f.) certainly refers to a French synod, but it is very improbable that it had the sanction of Gregory, so far as Berengar's case was concerned. Schwabe does not discuss events in these years.

[4] Jaffé, *Mon. Greg.* (p. 317), Reg. v. 20. Hugh of Die was in Rome before May 22, 1078 (*ibid.* p. 319, v. 22).

[5] *Ibid.* p. 317 (v. 21).

Spain,[1] who is mentioned by name, and probably also Hugh of Die, who was returning to France with a legatine commission, in order to convene a council to settle a dispute at Orleans,[2] and to negotiate with the Archbishop of Reims and the bishops of France on the primacy question,[3] would also carry with them Gregory's instructions to the Abbot of Cluny on the Berengarian dispute.[4] Long before August 22, 1078, Hugh of Die was back in France.[5] No reply of Gregory to Berengar's letter has survived, but the Scolasticus doubtless received, through the embassy which brought the reply to the Abbot of Cluny, a summons to attend a Roman Council in the autumn of 1078. If the Berengarian question was to be examined again by conciliar action, it could only be officially reopened at Rome. This had been Gregory's policy at Tours. It was also Berengar's wish. No doubt Hildebrand hoped that his influence now as Pope would be able to secure a settlement which had all along been desired by him, a settlement not unfavourable to Berengar, and one which would satisfy reasonable orthodox demands.

The time of Berengar's arrival in Italy is not known,[6] but no doubt he began the journey with little delay after the Pope's summons arrived. Gregory's attitude throughout the proceedings of the Council of 1078 fully justified Berengar's confidence in his support. The Council met on November 1. Gregory proposed that Berengar should recite a definition of belief in the Eucharist similar to that which was offered to him at Tours:

> I profess that the bread of the altar, after consecration, is the true body of Christ, which was born of the Virgin, suffered on the Cross, and which sits on the right hand of the Father, and that

---

[1] Jaffé, *Mon. Greg.*, p. 317 (v. 21).

[2] *Ibid.* p. 317 (v. 20).

[3] *Ibid.* p. 319 (v. 22).

[4] *Ibid.* p. 317 (v. 21).

[5] *Ibid.* p. 325 (vi. 2).

[6] Schwabe, p. 123, loosely quoting Berengar's account of the Council of 1078 (Martène and Durand, iv. 103c), says that he arrived at the end of 1077 or the beginning of 1078, and remained nearly a year till November 1078. But it is unlikely that Berengar left for Rome before the embassy, mentioned in Gregory's letter to Hugh of Cluny (Jaffé, p. 317, May 7, 1078), reached France in the summer of 1078. The delay of a year (Martène and Durand, iv. 103c) mentioned by Berengar may refer to the interval between the despatch of his letter to Gregory (Sudendorf, p. 230) and the Council in the autumn of 1078.

the wine of the altar, after consecration, is the true blood which flowed from the side of Christ, not only in sign and virtue of the sacrament but in property of nature and truth of substance. And what I pronounce with my mouth, I say that I hold in my heart, so help me God, and His holy Gospel.[1]

---

[1] Martène and Durand, iv. 104d. Our chief source for the Roman Councils 1078–79 is Berengar's own account (*ibid.* pp. 103–109), together with the additional passage from an old Gembloux MS., printed by Mabillon (*Annales*, v. 139). Bouq., xi. 531d., and Rieberer, xxi. 48, following Martène and Durand, iv. 102, think this account is wrongly assigned to Berengar. Stäudlin, ii. 82 ff., thinks it is rightly ascribed to Berengar, but is not altogether trustworthy. He summarises Rieberer's objections against Berengar's authorship: (1) This document does not contain Mabillon's additional passage. (2) The Bishop of Pisa died October 25, 1080, and not 'by an unaccustomed death' as Berengar suggests. (3) The Bishop of Padua lived till 1090, and so outlived Berengar, who alleged that he died after being run through with a sword. (4) Peter Damiani is spoken of as if still alive, but he was dead by 1072. (5) Damiani's writings do not bear out Berengar's statement that he favoured Berengar's views.

Stäudlin rightly urges on the contrary: (1) The document has been attacked in order to clear Gregory VII from the suspicion of heresy. (2) It does not necessarily imply that Damiani was alive, and even if Damiani did not actually support Berengar in his writings, Gregory could still have appealed to him (*infra*, p. 186). (3) It only reports what is said of the Bishop of Pisa. (We may add that the time after his death in 1080 was not too late for Berengar to have written his report, and so his statement concerning the Bishop of Pisa may be quite correct.) (4) If Ughelli's report (*Italia Sacra*, iii. 364, in Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, vi. 108d) of the death of the Bishop of Padua is correct, Berengar's statement is only an error in the report which reached him. (But we may note that it is not the kind of error he usually repeats.) (5) The absence of Mabillon's passage does not invalidate the document. It contains internal marks of genuineness. It is entirely in Berengar's style and manner and tone of thought and character.

Among modern critics, Reuter, i. 122 f., and Schwabe, p. 122, accept it, the latter as a biased statement. Schnitzer, p. 99 n. 2, accepts it as genuine, but thinks that its statements are frequently untrustworthy. Ébersolt, p. 151, accepts it. It may be added that the trustworthiness of Berengar's statements in the *De Sacra Cœna*, notably in the case of the reordinations, which has been established by modern writers, enables us to place more confidence in the *Acta Concilii Romani* than was possible in the case of earlier writers.

Reports of both councils are given by Bernold, *De Ber. Haer. Damn.* (Rieberer, xxi. 81; Migne, 148, 1456c) and *Chronica* (*Mon. Ger. SS.*, v. 435; Migne, 148, 1377b–d, *cf.* 809 d–f. *Cf. infra*, p. 189 n. 2); Mabillon, *Annales*, v. 139; Mansi, xx. 516, 523; Bouq., xi. 530c. The February Council only is reported by Hugh of Flavigny, but under 1078 (*Mon. Ger. SS.*, viii. 443; Bouq., xiii. 620b). Peter of Pisani (Watterich, *Pont. Rom. Vit.*, i. 299 f.) reports the Council of 1079 only. In Bernold, *De Ber. Haer. Damn.* (Rieberer, xxi. 81; Migne, 148, 1457a), the dates are erroneous: 1088 is given as Leo IX's first year instead of 1048/49, and 1089 as the date of Gregory's February Council. He mentions an interval of forty years, which roughly accounts for the error of the second date. But Gregory VII was dead in 1085. The official decree of 1079 appears in Jaffé, *Mon. Greg.*, p. 352 f.; Mirbt, *Quellen*, p. 145; Lanfranc (Migne, This announcement was received with applause, especially when Gregory pointed out that it contained nothing to which anyone could raise objection. It met the requirements of faith, especially the needs of less sturdy minds to whom milk rather than strong meat should be given, a statement which had the authority of Augustine, who said : ‘ That which you see on the altar is bread and wine as your eyes tell you, but faith insists that the bread is the body of Christ and the wine is His blood.’ Berengar, announced Gregory to the assembly, was no heretic, his teaching came from the holy Scripture and not from his own heart. Peter Damiani, who was not inferior to Lanfranc in scholarship or spiritual worth, had at Rome declined to agree with the teaching of Lanfranc on the Eucharist,[1] and the Pope maintained that Damiani's opinion rather than that of Lanfranc should be accepted, especially as he was even more painstaking in the study of sacred writings.[2]

Gregory thought that the violence of the opposition had been checked, especially as he had caused books to be collected beforehand by the bishops, abbots, and clergy, and had ordered selected passages from the works of Augustine, Jerome, and Ambrose to be read out. Many of the leading clergy expressed satisfaction with Berengar, and among them the Bishops of Porto, Sutri, and Terracina ;[3] Cardinals Atto of Milan and Deusdedit ; Peter the Roman Chancellor, ‘ the kind and humble-hearted brother beyond the Alps ’ ; Fulk, the clerk of Hildebrand, ‘ no less a friend ’ ; Tetbald, whose learning at Rome was famous, and Bonadies. The names of many others Berengar could not remember.[4] But his enemies were not silenced by the Pope's obvious desire to clear him, even when it was supported by this large body of opinion in the Council. Moreover, the animosity of

150, 411b–c) ; Mansi, xx. 523. *Cf.* Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 29 f. ; *Hist. Litt.*, viii. 210 ; de Roye, p. 73 ; Schröchk, xxiii. 548 ; Neander, vi. 330 ff. ; Sudendorf, p. 58 f. ; Gfrörer, *Greg. VII*, i. 602, vii. 681 ; Martens, i. 249 ff. ; Héfélé–Leclercq, v. pt. i. 243, 248–250—a deficient account.

[1] Neukirch, p. 58, maintains that this statement is not borne out by Damiani's writings. But if Damiani wrote nothing which reflects Berengar's teaching, neither can anything be found which agrees with the teaching of the extreme orthodox writers (*infra*, p. 332 f.).

[2] Martène and Durand, iv. 103c.

[3] Schnitzer, p. 101, has Ferrara in place of Terracina.

[4] Martène and Durand, iv. 103e.

ecclesiastical politics exerted its influence. Gregory had many enemies in Rome and elsewhere at this time. The humiliation of the Emperor Henry IV had taken place at Canossa on January 25, 1077, and a large party among the clergy were supporters of the imperial policy, even if antipathy towards Gregory was the main cause of their hostility. The opposing faction now urged that the matter should be adjourned until the Lenten Synod of 1079, hoping thereby, as Berengar says, to gather more of their supporters in Rome, when it would be easy to upset the Pope's plans.[1] Possibly in order to pacify these people, Gregory announced that on the next day Berengar would confirm his assent to the formula already accepted by an oath, and by the ordeal of the hot iron. Berengar left the Council in order to spend the night in prayer.[2] He poured forth his trouble of mind in the beautiful poem *Juste Judex, Jesu Christe*, which bears all the signs of rapid composition under the stress of great emotion :

Jesu Christ, thou just Assessor,
King of Kings and Lord of Lords,
Reigning ever with the Father
And the Sanctifying Flame,
Deign to answer my petition,
Listening of thy clemency.
Thou from heaven hast descended
To the Virgin's humble womb,
So receiving human body,
Thou hast visited thy slave,
To redeem our human nature
Through thine own, thy precious blood.
Asking that thy glorious passion—
O ! my God, I cry out now—
May defend me without ceasing
'Gainst the peril gathering round,
So that I may ever steadfast
In thy service stand my ground.
Ever with me be thy power,
Ever with me thy defence,
Lest the onrush of the foemen
Break and overturn my mind ;
Lest it damn my mortal body
By a fraudulent device.

---

[1] Martène and Durand, iv. 103d–104a.

[2] *Ibid.* 108a.

Thou hast broken by thy vigour
Gates and bars of Acheron,
Shatter now my hostile foemen,
Yea ! and break their ambuscade,
Which they laid to make an entry
To the pathways of my heart.
Listen to me crying to Thee,
Wretched in my wrong-doing,
Show thy solace to the seeker
Crying out for piety,
Lest my enemies arising
Drive me to a vile disgrace.
Let them be destroyed and languish—
They who wish to ruin me
May the snare of their own ambush
Catch them in its own device.
O ! good Jesu, Jesu righteous,
Do not choose to go from me,
My protector, my defender,
Be Thou to me as a shield,
I resisting—Thou o'ercoming
All who basely slander me,
That I may rejoice for ever
In those base men overcome.
Send thy Holy Spirit hither
From the blessed realms on high,
That my counsel Thou mayst lighten,
Through His splendour light'ning me ;
That He may repel the hatred
Of those base men hating me.
Fortify my senses, Jesu,
By the sign of holy cross,
By the ensign of its triumph
Bring about my victory.
May the foeman, lying prostrate,
Feel his vigour flow away.
Mercy on me ! Christ, thou God-born,
Mercy ! angels of the Lord,
Ever be Thou mindful of me,
Giving pardon for my sins.
Father, Son and Holy Spirit,
Thou who always livest—God,
Power to Thee, honour always
While mankind ascribes thee Lord.[1]

---

[1] Martène and Durand, iv. 115 f. ; Ébersolt, p. 153. I have translated the verses from Ébersolt's edition. The monk Clarius in *Chron. S. Petri Vivi. Senonensis* (Bouq., xii. 279d) ascribed the poem to Berengar.

And, after the sun was set, Berengar's prayer was answered, and the fear of the hot iron, which had entered into his soul, was removed. The Lord Abbot of Monte Casino, then of the highest authority in the papal palace, came with a message from the Pope, ordering him to abandon his vigil, to go to the guest-house, there to refresh his body, since Gregory had decided to abandon the ordeal.[1]

Meanwhile 'those base men' had not been inactive. They called to their assistance the learned Cardinal-Deacon Alberic, who asked for a delay of a week in which to compose a written refutation of the opinions of Berengar.[2] But Gregory, who had doubtless abandoned the ordeal when he saw the implacable attitude of the opposition, adjourned the case to the Lenten Synod of 1079, yet he did not abandon his efforts to bring about a decision which might satisfy both sides, and particularly one which would secure the safe and happy return of Berengar to France. Before the month was out, the matter may have received attention again at the synod held on November 19,[3] but we have no record of this, and it is improbable that Gregory would risk a repetition of the indecisive result obtained less than three weeks before.

---

[1] Martène and Durand, iv. 108b.

[2] Peter the Deacon, *Chron. Monasterii Casinensis* (*Mon. Ger. SS.*, vii. 728; Migne, 173, 766c); *Liber de Viris Illustribus Casinensibus* (Migne, 173, 1033b). Rieberer, xxi. 45, suggests that Alberic's book was read at the November Council of 1078, a chronology which Mabillon has followed (*Annales*, v. 139). Mabillon (*ibid.*) searched for Alberic's book at Constance and Florence, but failed to find it. Schwabe, p. 127, suggests its composition between the two Councils. Schnitzer, p. 105, reports Alberic's presence at the Lenten Council of 1079, but he inclines to Schwabe's view (p. 105 n. 3).

Another synod was held at Rome on November 19, 1078 (Mansi, xx. 507; Jaffé, *Mon. Greg.*, p. 330). Possibly the reading of Alberic's treatise, or even the request for permission to write it, may be assigned to this synod. His effective intervention at the Council of 1079 suggests a careful previous consideration of the question at issue (*infra*, p. 192). Bernold, *Chronica* (*Mon. Ger. SS.*, v. 455; Migne, 148, 1377b), says that the case was first tried by Gregory then. But Bernold, in this record, clearly confuses the Council of November 19 with that of All Saints' Day. Although he wrote soon after the incidents occurred (he died in 1100), yet his dates are notoriously faulty. In the *Chronica* he places the Synod of Tours in 1056, and Berengar's death in 1083. In the *De Ber. Haer. Damnat. Mult.* he gives 1089 as the date of Berengar's condemnation under Gregory VII. But *cf. supra*, p. 185 n. 1 *fin.* On Bernold *cf.* E. Winkelmann in Pertz, *Geschichtschreibe der deutschen Vorzeit*, x. (XI Jahrhundert) (1863), and H. E. Schulzen, *De Bertoldi et Bernaldi Chronicis* (1867). On the Council of Nov. 19, 1078, *cf.* Martens, i. 249, and Delarc, *Saint Grégoire VII*, iii. 448 f.

[3] *Supra*, n. 2.

A few days before the Lenten Synod assembled the Pope summoned Berengar into his presence, together with the Bishop of Porto. Gregory informed Berengar that he believed that his teaching on the Eucharist had the authority of Scripture, but that, following his custom, whenever he was troubled about a decision which had to be made, he had determined to appeal to the Virgin Mary. A few days before he had asked a certain pious friend of his to fast and pray, and then to intercede with the Virgin concerning Berengar's teaching. All this had been done, and the Virgin had said that nothing was to be believed concerning the doctrine of the Eucharist, save what was taught by Scripture, and that Berengar's teaching was not contrary to Scripture. Berengar reports that Gregory had informed him of this incident so that he might have the greater confidence in the Pope,[1] but obviously behind the account lies an attempt made by Gregory to secure the most compliant attitude possible from Berengar. The emphasis in the story is laid on the statement that the norm for eucharistic doctrine was the Scripture. It conveyed a hint to Berengar to make no appeal save to Scripture. The Pope's anger, when Berengar reported the incident in the Council, proves that Gregory was not attempting, by this device, to overawe the popular mind by an appeal to a miraculous intervention of the Virgin. He resorted to another and less dangerous measure in order to influence the minds of the cardinals and the Roman clergy. A fast was imposed on them, so that God might reveal to them the true doctrine of the Eucharist. He sent Cardinals Atto and Cuno and the Archpriest Suppo to the Church of S. Anastasia, to remain there for three days, singing Psalms and Masses, that Christ might vouchsafe to give them the sign which had been granted to Gregory the Great for the confirmation of a woman's faith. On that occasion the Host was revealed as a finger lying on the altar,[2] but in this instance, naturally, as Gregory had foreseen, the test failed, for no sign was given.[1] There was nothing unreasonable or unusual in this procedure. To call the cardinals into retreat before coming to an important decision in council was to make use of a well-known practice. It was possible that amid the quiet of a religious retreat a spirit of unanimity might be encouraged, and that the way might be paved for a peaceful solution of the difficulty when the council opened. By the failure of the test in the Church of S. Anastasia, Gregory hoped to influence the minds of the extremists in a reasonable direction.

---

[1] Martène and Durand, iv. 108e.

[2] *Infra*, p. 251.

Over one hundred and fifty bishops and abbots, together with a large body of other clergy, assembled for the Lenten Synod. Henry, Patriarch of Aquileia, Peter, Bishop of Albano, Anselm of Lucca, Landulf of Pisa, Ulric of Padua, Hugh of Die, Altmann of Passau are mentioned by Bernold, who was himself an eye-witness of the proceedings.[2] The Council opened its sessions on February 11, 1079, in the Church of S. Salvator,[3] with a long discussion on the doctrine of the Eucharist, in which both sides maintained their ground, although the majority upheld the view that the bread and wine, through the prayer of the consecrating priest and by the action of the Holy Spirit, who operates invisibly, are substantially converted into the body of the Lord, which was born of the Virgin, and which hung upon the Cross; and into the blood which was shed from His side, by the lance of the soldier, quoting Greek and Latin Fathers in support of their views. The other party maintained that the eucharistic body was a figure of the true body of Christ, which was sitting substantially at the right hand of the Father.[4] The monk Bruno, afterwards Bishop of Segni,[5] and Alberic the Cardinal-

---

[1] The second incident was reported by Cardinal Benno (Goldast, *De Vita Hildebrandi* (1611), p. 3; *cf.* Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 73; *Annales*, v. 140; Schnitzer, *Die Gesta. Rom. Eccles. der Kard. Beno*, p. 36 f.). Schnitzer, *Berengar von Tours*, p. 103 n. 1, rejects both reports as legends. Schwabe, p. 124, accepts the account of Berengar. He does not mention that of Benno. No doubt Cardinal Benno's account was touched up. He was a bitter enemy of Gregory (*infra*, p. 196). The account of the Virgin Mary is rejected by Döllinger, i. (1843) 377.

[2] Rieberer, xxi. 84; Migne, 148, 1487a.

[3] Lanfranc (Migne, 150, 411b); Mansi, xx. 523d; Migne, 148, 811a.

[4] Jaffé, p. 352 f.; Mansi, xx. 523c ff.; Migne, 148, 809 f.; *Chron.* of Hugh of Flavigny (Migne, 154, 316); *Chron. Mon. Cas.* (*Mon. Ger. SS.*, vii. 728).

[5] Mabillon, *Annales*, v. 139; *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 29.

Deacon[1] concentrated the discussion on Berengar. Then through the intervention of Landulf, Bishop of Pisa, and Ulric, Bishop of Padua,[2] a new formula was produced, in which the word ' substantialiter ' had been introduced through the influence of ' that demon ' Alberic, as Berengar says :[3]

> I believe with my heart and confess with my mouth that the bread and wine which are placed on the altar, through the mystery of the consecrating prayer, and the words of our Redeemer, are converted substantially (substantialiter) into the true body and proper life-giving flesh and blood of Jesus Christ our Lord, and after consecration are the true body of Christ which was born of the Virgin, and which as an offering for the salvation of the world hung upon the Cross, and sits on the right hand of the Father ; and the true blood of Christ, which was poured out from His side, not only through the sign and virtue of the Sacrament, but in actuality of nature and truth of substance,[4] as is contained in this formula, I have read and you have understood. So I believed, nor against this faith will I teach anything more, so help me God and this holy Gospel.[5]

The addition of the word ' substantialiter ' troubled Berengar. It seemed to pin him down to the interpretation of his adversaries. He seized the document, but after hastily reading it through perceived that it would bear his own interpretation, and that by the insertion of a saving clause, ' saving the substance of the bread,'[6] he could circumvent its verbal meaning. He promptly said that he was ready to read the formula. But after he had done so the opposing bishops, who saw through his device, charged him with reading it according to his own interpretation and not theirs, and they clamoured that he should swear an oath, affirming that he accepted its meaning in the same sense as they. This demand

---

[1] *Chron. Mon. Cas.* (*Mon. Ger. SS.*, vii. 728) ; Peter the Deacon (Migne, 173, 766c, 1033b). *Cf.* Mabillon, *Annales*, v. 139.

[2] Berengar, *Acta* (Martène and Durand, iv. 104b–c).

[3] Mabillon, *Annales*, v. 139 : ' Casinus ille, non monachus, sed demoniacus Albericus . . . adderem substantialiter.' This fragment was found by Mabillon in an old Gembloux MS. (*cf.* his *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 62), and is not included among the fragments printed by Martène and Durand.

[4] Martène and Durand, iv. 104c–d.

[5] Lanfranc (Migne, 150, 411b–c) ; *Chron.* of Hugh of Flavigny (Migne, 154, 316d). The additional words, ' Sicut in hoc brevi continetur . . . et haec sacra evangelia,' were not reported by Berengar. *Cf.* Migne, 148, 809a ; Jaffé, p. 553 ; Mirbt, p. 145.

[6] ' salva sua substantia.'

Berengar attempted to evade by saying that he took his stand on what had passed between himself and the Pope a few days before, when he had given his full consent to the understanding then reached. This indiscretion ruined Berengar's case. It involved the Pope in the opprobrium of Berengar's own teaching, and gave the imperialist bishops an opportunity they were seeking to exploit against him. 'Like a bolt' Gregory came down on him, and commanded him to prostrate himself on the ground and confess that he erred on that very day by omitting the word 'substantially' when stating his belief that the bread and wine on the altar are the body and blood of the Lord. 'What shall I say, disturbed by the sudden madness of the Pope, and lest he should pronounce the anathema upon me, and the mob should seize me for the death it desired of me, I flung myself down and confessed that I had erred.'[1]

Berengar's action had brought on a crisis which Gregory could only meet by vigorous action. The cleverness of Berengar's adversaries had driven the Scolasticus to a subterfuge which even the friendly Pope could not overlook. The prevaricating manner in which he read the formula did not escape the cardinals. Yet it was Berengar's impulsive appeal to Gregory which finally ruined his case. He was a man of intellect, not of spirit. In a literary debate he was a match for any of the controversialists of the day, and the strength of his arguments had half convinced Gregory. But when brought face to face with his enemies in the heated atmosphere of the Council chamber, he lost his wits, and after floundering before the final onslaught of foes who knew how to repress a retreating enemy, he collapsed into utter submission. With full knowledge of his own weakness had he prayed

> Lest the onrush of the foemen
> Break and overturn my mind.[2]

The same had happened at Rome in 1059. There is a strong resemblance between Berengar and Thomas of York, who collapsed before Lanfranc in a similar manner at the Council of Winchester in 1072.[1]

---

[1] Martène and Durand, iv. 109b.

[2] Ébersolt, p. 153:

> 'Mentem meam ne perturbet
> Hostium incursio.'

To quell finally the antagonism of the cardinals, and to clear his own reputation, Gregory was compelled to take another step. He gave notice that if Berengar's submission had been merely personal to himself, he should be imprisoned under the special supervision of the Curia, and this decision was announced to Berengar by the Abbot of Monte Casino and the Neapolitan Peter.[2] Berengar then repeated his submission before the whole Council, whereupon Gregory formally absolved him, but charged him never again to discuss the doctrine of the body and blood of Christ, save to win back those who had been perverted by him.[3]

The chief significance of the Council of Rome (1079) was the final defeat of Berengar after thirty years of conflict; it was not merely the shattering of his long-tried confidence in Gregory, but the surrender of religious enlightenment by the great Pope to political expediency.[4] Yet, perhaps at that

---

[1] Hugh the Chanter (Raine, *Historians of York*, ii. 101, Rolls Ser. No. 71).

[2] Martène and Durand, iv. 109c.

[3] Lanfranc (Migne, 150, 411c); Peter Pisani (Watterich, i. 300); Hugh of Flavigny (Migne, 154, 316d); Jaffé, p. 353.

[4] Lessing, p. 174, states that Gregory always sacrificed to expediency, an unfair judgment if applied to his policy outside the eucharistic controversy. Schnitzer, pp. 108–115, discusses the relationship of Gregory VII to Berengar, with the object of clearing Gregory from all suspicion of having been influenced by his teaching. Alexander II and Gregory VII showed indulgence towards Berengar on account of his staunch support of the movement for the reform of clerical life. There were not many men like Berengar in those days (p. 113). They were disposed to regard lightly his views on the Eucharist, because it was now clear that his influence was confined to the learned world, and was not being propagated among the people (p. 110 n. 2). Leo IX and Nicholas II, on the other hand, had been compelled to take a more serious view, because they could not foresee the end of the controversy. Up to 1079 Gregory was not convinced of Berengar's heterodoxy, but his prevarication over the word 'substantialiter' suddenly opened the Pope's eyes, and he forthwith abandoned Berengar (p. 113).

Yet Schnitzer's account is not quite consistent with itself. It suggests that Berengar's teaching was both tolerated and yet not clearly understood, but what is not understood cannot be said to be tolerated. Gregory must have perceived the implications of Berengar's teaching. Lanfranc's treatise had been received in Rome together with extracts from Berengar's earlier pamphlet. On p. 112 Schnitzer attempts, not very successfully, to overcome this difficulty by declaring that Gregory had no love for Lanfranc, and thought it hazardous to learn Berengar's teaching from an day, the welfare of the Church demanded the sacrifice. The enemies of Gregory, headed by Henry IV, were gathering for the final stage in the first great campaign between Papacy and Empire which Gregory had inaugurated.[1] Since the day of Canossa the cause of Henry had steadily improved.[2] Yet the reform of clerical life and the freedom of the Church from lay-interference, which at that day was seldom beneficial, especially in the exercise of patronage, depended entirely upon the success of Gregory's ecclesiastical programme. It is one of the tragedies of history that the policy by which that programme was being worked out threw itself across the dogmatic reform, headed by Berengar, which called for equally powerful support from the chief pontiff of the West, a result due partly to the fact that the zealots of practical reform were the grand reactionaries of orthodoxy, and so were opponents of the new eucharistic theory, and partly to the fact that in Berengar statesmanship was entirely lacking. If he failed to manifest the martyr's firm will and flaming zeal, he had the prophet's insight and clearness of vision, and showed the perseverance of the artist in nurturing the creation of his brain. For twenty-five years there was always a possibility that Berengar and Hildebrand might be linked together in an enterprise in which the deficiencies of each might be made up by the gifts of the other. If that union had been established, the reform of dogma would have been sponsored instead of repressed by the early medieval Popes, and the development of European civilisation might have been antedated by five

---

enemy's book. Gregory's change of front is more easily explained by his fear of the imperialist party among the bishops.

On the doctrinal point Kurtz, *Church History*, ii. (1881) 88, holds that Gregory stood midway between Berengar and Radbert. Ébersolt, p. 156, thinks that he had a personal predilection for Berengar; he had no clear idea on the Eucharist beyond that supplied by Scripture. *Cf. supra*, p. 113 n. 4.

[1] The influence of the investiture contest with Henry IV on Gregory's attitude to Berengar has escaped the attention of most modern writers. It is curious that Schwabe overlooked this important point. Martens, i. 249, alludes to it, but he thinks that the Pope's action was uncertain and perplexed. Reuter, i. 123 f., appreciates the point.

[2] *Cf.* A. Dammann, *Der Sieg Heinrichs IV in Kanossa*, ii. (1909) 4–6. Dammann doubts the historicity of this incident. He thinks the account of it was forged by the papal writers, who influenced the reports which have come down to us.

centuries. Moreover, the Papacy would have been instrumental in supplying western Catholicism with a theology of its own, not derived from the worn-out themes of Greek theologians, nor, on the other hand, dissevered from original and fundamental sources of human thought like Platonism and the New Testament. But as in the time of Pelagius, the West, under the influence of Augustine, refused a theory of redemption which was not derived from Greek theology, so in the theory of Berengar it refused another product of the European mind, developed by the aid of an altogether different strand of Augustinianism, in order to defend a dogmatic interpretation of the Eucharist which had its roots in Gregory of Nyssa and John of Damascus.[1]

Although Gregory VII had condemned the teaching of Berengar by a judicial sentence, suspicion concerning his own orthodoxy remained. His political enemies made full use of the opportunity which Gregory's share in the controversy had placed in their hands. Towards the end of 1078 Agilbert, Archbishop-elect of Trèves, had written of Gregory: 'Behold a Pope and chief-bishop who doubts whether that which is taken from the Lord's Table is true body and blood of Christ.'[2] On June 25, 1080, a synod of thirty bishops, led by Cardinal Benno, met at Brixen under the auspices of the Emperor Henry IV. Here Hildebrand, 'the false monk' and 'old disciple of Berengar,' was excommunicated for riotous behaviour and for attacking the Catholic faith. The signature of the Emperor appears attached to the decree.[3]

But if Hildebrand was privately convinced that Berengar's teaching was not heterodox, and if he repeatedly attempted to secure a fair hearing for Berengar at Rome, his own statements on the doctrine of the Eucharist were couched in orthodox terms. In this there was nothing contradictory with his attitude to Berengar. Until the Curia had definitely pronounced in Berengar's favour, Gregory was not likely to modify the expression of his own beliefs.[1]

---

[1] *Cf.* Gore, *Dissertations*, p. 230 ff.; *Body of Christ* (1902), p. 114 f.

[2] Udalrich of Bamberg, *Codex Epistolaris* (Eckhart, ii. 170); Schnitzer, *Die Gesta Rom. Eccles. der Kardinals Beno* (1892), p. 37.

[3] Pertz, *Mon. Ger. Leges*, ii. 51 f.; Ekkehard, *Chron. Universale* (*Mon. Ger. SS.*, vi. 203 f.; Migne, 154, 951a–c); Mabillon, *Annales*, v. 140. Martens, i. 216, suggests that these reports of Gregory have been influenced by that of a monk named Hildebrand, mentioned in the *Opuscula* of Abbot Hugo (997–1039) in the *Historia Farfensis* (*Mon. Ger. SS.*, xi. 535–538). But this is hardly probable.

In the meantime Gregory did not relax his efforts to succour his former protégé, now that the latter had yielded. After keeping him some months longer in Rome, he sent him back to Angers, protected by the following safe-conduct:

> Gregory to all the faithful. We make known to you all that by the authority of Almighty God, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, we have placed the anathema on all who shall presume to do any injury to Berengar, a son of the Roman Church, either to his person or any of his possessions, or who shall call him a heretic, whom, after the long visit which he made to us according to our will, we send home, and with him our faithful servant Fulk.[2]

---

[1] These are made known in his 'Epistle' (Feb. 16, 1074) to Countess Matilda of Tuscany (Jaffé, p. 65 ff.; Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 75; *cf.* Sudendorf, p. 186), in which he quotes Gregory the Great: '(Christus) pro nobis iterum in hoc mysterio sacrae oblationis immolatur; ejus quippe ibi corpus sumitur, ejus caro in populi salutem partitur, ejus sanguis non jam in manus infidelium, sed in ora fidelium funditur,' and Chrysostom: 'Videte, quemadmodum sponsam sibi Christus conjunxit; videte, quo vos cibo satietatis enutrit. Ipse nobis cibi substantia est atque nutrimentum. Nam, sicut mulier, affectionis natura cogente, genitum alere sui lactis foecunditate festinat, sic et Christus, quos ipse regenerat, suo sanguine semper enutrit.' Wido of Ferrara (*Mon. Ger. SS.*, xii. 155) reports that Gregory daily celebrated the Mass and wept during the service. Bishop Haymo of Autun, who was returning from a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, reports that shortly before the death of Gregory at Salerno (1085) he was present at a gathering of the clergy there, when the Pope addressed them: 'de credulitate corporis et sanguinis domini.' On the other hand, a late twelfth-century writer, Johannes Parisiensis, a member of the Order of Preachers (d. 1306), in his *Determinatio de modo existendi Corpus Christi in Sacramento Altaris* (London, 1686), p. 7, quotes a Parisian MS., from the *Codex S. Victor*, attributing to 'Hildebrand' uncertain views on the Eucharist. The eucharistic change is 'not formal, because the substance of the bread and wine remains. Whether it is substantial is not clear. . . . We leave uncertain what is professed to be certain by the authorities. The substance of the bread and wine is converted into the substance of the body and blood of Christ, but the means of the change, we blush to say we do not know.' Schnitzer, p. 109 n. 3, says that there is nothing to show that Gregory wrote this. We may add that it can be definitely dissociated from Gregory's epoch. It reflects the thought of a later generation.

[2] Jaffé, p. 550. Berengar described 'Fulk the clerk' of Hildebrand, who attended the Council of 1078, as 'no less a friend' (*supra*, p. 186).

CHAPTER XI

LAST YEARS AT TOURS

AFTER his return to Anjou in the autumn of 1079,[1] a revulsion of mind overtook Berengar, similar to that which he experienced after the Roman Council of 1059. He now wrote a spirited defence of his behaviour before the Councils, and poured out his feelings against Gregory, although not in the abusive terms used of Nicholas II. He complained of the Pope's fickleness [2] and sudden madness,[3] which allowed Gregory to be overthrown by the calumniators of truth.[4] But unlike the earlier attacks on Leo IX and Nicholas II, this account does not appear to have been written for the purpose of propaganda, but rather to ease his mind by a confession of his own weakness, and as an appeal to the sympathy of posterity.[5] 'Almighty God, who shewest thy almighty power chiefly in forgiveness and mercy, have mercy on me, thou Fount of Mercy. I confess my great sacrilege. Pardon my wretchedness, restore to me the joy of thy salvation, before thy Blessed One comes in thy majesty, in the company of the angels, in order to expiate with fire the great sins which I have committed against Thee.' He appealed to all who read his account: 'O! my brothers in Christ, on whom this document shall chance, extend to my aid the strong power of Christian love, see with pity the tears of my confession, so that your prayers may propitiate God's mercy for me.' [6]

His sentiments became known, for on September 30, 1080, he was summoned before the Synod of Bordeaux, held by the legates Amatus of Oleron and Hugh of Die, in the presence of

---

[1] Gregory refers in the safe-conduct to Berengar's long stay at Rome, a detail also made known by Berengar (Martène and Durand, iv. 103c).

[2] Martène and Durand, iv. 104b.

[3] *Ibid.* 109a.

[4] *Ibid.* 104b.

[5] *Ibid.* 104c ff.

[6] *Ibid.* 109e.

Joscelin, Archbishop of Bordeaux; Radulf, Archbishop of Tours; William of Auxerre; Boso of Saintonge, and other bishops. No details of the proceedings have survived beyond the report that Berengar 'gave a reason for his faith.' [1]

Everyone was weary of the dispute, and doubtless Berengar gave little trouble at the Synod, especially as Fulk, Count of Anjou, was now taking active steps against him. Possibly Fulk, who down to this time had left him in peace, was annoyed by some indications of his state of mind after his return from Rome, and whatever persecution Berengar suffered at the hands of the Count may, like the action of the Synod of Bordeaux, have been the result of his own behaviour. The measures taken by the Count were sufficiently drastic to call forth a letter from Gregory VII to Radulf of Tours and Eusebius of Angers, authorising them to order the Count to desist, and commanding them to protect Berengar against all his enemies.[2] Possibly Fulk's attitude made further residence at Angers impossible and hastened Berengar's retreat to Tours. One authority says that he lived in retirement at Tours for eight[3] years before his death, so he withdrew there in 1080. He is mentioned among the opponents of Radulf the Archbishop in a report, dated 1081, of the dispute over his election between Radulf and the Chapter of Tours.[4] In this report Berengar is given the title of 'Scholae-Magister,' so that he may have taken up his office and work again in the schools of S. Martin's for a time.[5]

One more attempt was made to involve the Scolasticus in political machinations. Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, the half-brother of the Conqueror, who had been made Earl of Kent, conceived the ambition of succeeding Gregory in the Papacy. At Brixen Gregory VII was set aside, by the imperialist bishops, in favour of Wipert, Archbishop of Ravenna, who became the anti-Pope, Clement III. Odo made use of his great wealth to secure influence at Rome among the cardinals and citizens. He caused gold to be distributed freely, and ordered a palace to be built for himself in the city. All his life he had been a liberal benefactor of poor students, and some of his protégés had been educated at Tours, where the liberal thinking of Berengar seems to have appealed to Odo, who was also a man of independent mind. There was another bond between them. They were both enemies of Lanfranc. When Lanfranc became Archbishop of Canterbury and the confidential adviser of the Conqueror, he not only secured an office which Odo coveted, but became a hindrance to the ambitious schemes of the Bishop of Bayeux.[1] Odo now attempted to secure the aid of Berengar by offering to give him his assistance. But Berengar had already declined to lend support to the political schemes of Philip of France, and he now refused the aid offered by Odo.

---

[1] *Chron. S. Maxentii* or *Malleacensis* (Marchegay and Mabille, p. 407; Bouq., xii. 401b); Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 32; *Hist. Litt.*, vii. 213. The signatories are given by Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., 868.

[2] Jaffé, p. 564, dates the letter *c.* 1080. It is our only authority for the ill-treatment of Berengar by Fulk. Sudendorf, p. 51, dates it 1073. Schwabe, p. 128 n. 1, thinks it could have been written before the Council of 1078, and compares it with another letter of Gregory to the two bishops, printed by Jaffé, p. 498. Schnitzer, p. 82 n. 1, compares it with Gregory's letter to Radulf and Eusebius, printed by Bishop, p. 274. The similarity of phraseology probably arose from the fact that the same scribe in the papal chancellery wrote these letters.

[3] Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 67.

[4] *Narratio Controversiae* (Bouq., xii. 460e).

[5] He signed two documents as 'Scholae-Magister' in 1080 and 1078–84 (Mabille, *Pancarte Noir*, pp. 496, 497).

Blessed be the Lord God Almighty, the Father of mercies and all consolation, the God who slays and makes to live ; who pierces through and heals, who has frustrated your enemies, both those who instigated and those who attacked, from the expectation of their malignity so that they should not cause thee to fall, who with an almighty hand raised thy worth above their worthlessness. In order therefore that you may never show yourself ungrateful for such benefits, may the same Father of mercies drain the pit of corruption from the depth of your heart, so that you may love Him uncorruptly, . . . that He may make you as an arrow in the hand of the mighty, a son of the proven, worthy of Himself, whom, having been placed at the helm of the Church, and promoted from strength to strength, He orders to ascend to His people that is ready. For the rest, as for the fact that your worship is moved to restore my affairs, I being beneath all compassions of the Lord, wait as suppliant, though not with perfect humility, upon the kindness of His almighty Spirit, lest my sin becomes greater than for me to merit forgiveness, lest He destroy my soul with sinners and my life with the blood-thirsty. . . . I drew away from

---

[1] *Cf.* Sudendorf, pp. 187–195.

> the multitude of sorrows in my heart as it were to most pleasant realms, to the multitude of His consolations, among which I hold chiefly the fact that your highness feels thus towards me. Farewell. From writing to you carefully—although I ought sufficiently—the haste of your messenger prevented me.[1]

In 1082, through the intervention of Lanfranc, Odo was arrested by the Conqueror in the Isle of Wight, when about to embark on an expedition to Rome, accompanied by the Earl of Chester and many armed men. He was imprisoned and remained in confinement until William's death.[2] Berengar's reply indicates that he was weary of the conflict, and in a chastened frame of mind had withdrawn from the public prosecution of his case. Soon after going back to Tours he retired to the island of Côme in the river near the city.

After the death of Gregory VII on May 25, 1085, he wrote to Archbishop Joscelin of Bordeaux:

> The sudden death of our Gregory disturbs me not a little, but so far as I appear to have known the man, I am certain of his salvation, no matter what may be the prejudiced opinion of those who, according to the Lord's saying, 'strain at a gnat and swallow a camel.' 'In Christ Jesus,' saith the apostle, 'circumcision is nothing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.' That he was such, so far as I knew him, I trust to the divine mercy. Barnabas departed from Paul, so that he could not remain with him according to the outward man, but no less, according to the inward man, did Barnabas remain in the book of life. The divine mercy does not so relate itself to men, that it abandons, for a few light offences, those who are not wanting in the highest and as it were universal things. Any such course would be considered most unjust even amongst men. But if they alleged 'Whosoever ye shall bind, shall be bound,' I say that to bind is not to bind indiscriminately and generally. Otherwise, the Lord will seem to have commanded any sins or misdeeds when He said 'Whatsoever ye will that men may do to you, even so do to them,' if the words 'ye will' are to be taken indiscriminately and generally. But to will is not to will foolishly and perversely. 'I will put a curse on your benedictions,' saith the Lord through the prophet to the bishops. From which it necessarily arises that he blesses the curses of such, and Augustine in his book on the sayings of the

---

[1] Sudendorf, p. 231.

[2] *Cf.* my *Lanfranc*, p. 252. This incident fixes the date of Berengar's letter as 1082.

Lord says 'Righteousness removes unrighteous bonds.' Gregory likewise: 'He deprives himself of this very power of binding and loosing, who exercises it, not on account of the behaviour of his subjects, but for the whims of his own will.' [1]

This letter reflects the condemnation of Gregory by his enemies at the Synod of Brixen, an incident which made a greater impression on the people of the time than historians have allowed. It reflects the calmer spirit which Berengar had developed since he went into retreat. His comments on Gregory's action in the Lenten Council of 1079 did not run to the extreme lengths of his abuse of Leo IX and Nicholas II, and now that the great Pope was dead he was able to look back on the happier incidents of their relationship, even as Barnabas might have looked back on some of the milder periods of his relationship with S. Paul.

The island of Côme, on the river Loire, near Tours, belonged, in the early part of the eleventh century, to Hugh, the Cellarer of S. Martin's cathedral church. Herveus the Younger, of Buzancy, the Treasurer of S. Martin's, who had restored the cathedral in 1001,[2] built a little church on the island in 1002 in honour of SS. Côme and Damianus,[3] and lived there for some years in seclusion. When he was recalled by the canons of S. Martin's he leased the church, with their consent, to twelve monks of the Abbey of Marmoutier (1012),[4] on condition that regular religious services were maintained in it.[5] In the same year Herveus also granted to Marmoutier a church on the banks of the Loire, situated on property leased by Guilduin of Saumery, Precentor of S. Martin's, from Count Odo.[1] After the death of Herveus litigation arose between S. Martin's and Marmoutier over the island of Côme, and it was returned to S. Martin's.[2] So Berengar was able to occupy it. In 1092 some canons of S. Martin's, apparently old pupils of Berengar, settled on the island of Côme, among them Hugh the Physician,[3] but in 1102 it passed finally to the Augustinian Canons.[4] On this island, then, Berengar lived in retreat for some years before his death in 1088.[5] During this period he seems to have devoted himself to a semi-eremitical life. Probably from this time dates his long and beautiful letter to some hermits who had written to him asking for instruction and encouragement.[6] If the style of this letter is in complete contrast with the tortuous diction of his correspondence, it is to be observed that when Berengar was moved by lofty spiritual emotion a clarification of his diction took place. The same clearness and beauty of expression mark his appeal to the Deity in the *Acta Concilii Romani.*[1] He replies to the hermits :

---

[1] Sudendorf, p. 232 f.; *cf.* p. 196 ff. Schwabe, p. 86 (followed by Schnitzer, p. 115), connects this letter with the death of Count Geoffrey Martel in 1060. But Bröcking, p. 79 n. 2, and Halphen, p. 125 n. 2, show that the ban was raised from Geoffrey long before his death. Bröcking disputes Schwabe's views on this letter. The concluding quotation from Gregory the Great appears in the *D.S.C.*, p. 37.

[2] *Chron. Breve Andegav.* (Martène and Durand, iii. 1380c); Mabillon, *Annales*, iv. 155. *Cf.* Nobilleau, *Bull. soc. archéol. Touraine*, iv. 280.

[3] Mabillon, *Annales*, iv. 155 (date 1001); *Vet. Analecta*, p. 516 (date 1002); *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 67.

[4] Vaucelle, p. 221, dated this lease 1022.

[5] Mabillon, *Annales*, iv. 155; *Vet. Analecta*, p. 516, quoting an old chronicle of Tours; *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 67, quoting the MS. *Lauriacensis*. *Cf.* Nobilleau, *Bull. soc. archéol. Touraine*, iv. 279 f.; *Cart. Touraingeau* (1879), p. 6; and Rabory, *Rev. du Monde cath.* (April-Aug. 1909), p. 70.

---

[1] Mabillon, *Annales*, iv. 155.

[2] Mabillon, *Vet. Analecta*, p. 516 ; *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 67.

[3] *Hist. Litt.*, vii. 54, viii. 214 ; Vaucelle, p. 262. Maan, 86, vii., quoting an old tablet at S. Martin's, which dates the origin of the little community at Côme from this time. Possibly there was, in 1092, some reassertion of the authority of S. Martin's over the island.

[4] Mabillon, *Vet. Analecta*, p. 576 ; *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 67. Nobilleau, *Bull. soc. archéol. Touraine*, iv. 280, and Vaucelle, p. 221 f., date the appearance of Augustinian canons at Côme back to 1092, possibly on the authority of the tablet at S. Martin's. The rule of the S. Martin's canons who occupied it in 1092 did not greatly differ from that of the later Augustinians.

[5] The MS. *Lauriacensis* quoted by Mabillon (*Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 67) says mistakenly that Berengar resided at Côme for twenty-eight years. But if this is the document quoted by Bouq., xii. 461, it says twenty-eight years from the Roman Council of 1059, which is approximately correct, save for the error that Berengar was not in retreat all that time. It confuses the events of 1059 with those of 1079, viz. the order of the Pope that Berengar should cease teaching, save to reconvert his old pupils—an instructive illustration of the small value to be attached sometimes to ancient and almost contemporary documents. Vaucelle, p. 349, repeats the error of twenty-eight years for Berengar's sojourn at Côme.

[6] Martène and Durand, i. 191–195. The letter is usually placed at the beginning of his career, during his first period as Scolasticus at Tours. Ébersolt, p. 22, and Schnitzer, p. 9 f., following Sudendorf, date it *c.* 1040. But the application of the hermits presupposes some acquaintance on the part of Berengar with the eremitical life, and this could not have been obtained until his closing years. The reports of his existence at Côme suggest that he had adopted a semi-hermit life. Moreover, the quaint allusion to himself as an ' infirm elephant ' suggests the fatigue of old age, and his admission that he can only strike at enemies with words, and the allusions to the broken horse and wounded lion, point to a date posterior to his long controversial career as the time when the letter was written.

> Your petitions are commands, your order is compulsion, your prayers are my chariot. You recently urged that I should write something to you by which devotion might be incited, ardour sharpened and attention directed. I confess that I fear to inflict upon doves flying in the free air the wings of the body of a pig, and it is presumption to haul out an infirm elephant. I am in the mire and you urge that I should purge you, when it were more fitting for me to be raised up by your hands, than that you should be excited by my eloquence. But humility which is the chief of all virtues, opens your mouths, so that you seek instruments[2] of warfare from him who knows not how to strike enemies, but only to declare against them. A horse runs, but it is written ' There is no harm in subduing a fleeing horse with the spur.' And the same man in another place, elegantly enough says ' The horse about to race of its own accord will go swiftly to the honours of the palm, if you urge it strongly.' A warlike trumpet stirs up the strong man to battle ; a wounded lion rises more swiftly to anger ; lynxes sleep when they are satisfied, after they are hungry they possess boldness for preying. The ant instructs man to salvation or labour.
>
> Ye are the horses of God. Ye are called to a race. Christ is among the spectators, your bridle is silence, the spurs which stimulate you are fear and love. Therefore it is necessary for those who join in the contest (to know) from whence they begin the race, how they should run, and whither they ought to run. From what do you run ? From the flesh. How ? Through righteousness. Whither ? To God. This is the right course—from the flesh, through righteousness, to God ; from Egypt, through the desert, to the land of promise ; from vice through virtue to a reward ; from nature through activity to happiness ; from the world, without the world, beyond the world. Indeed, ye ought not to remain in this in which ye were born, but ye shall go three days journey into the wilderness. What is solitude ? Heaven. Why ? Because it is solitary and pure from all malice. A journey of three days is necessary for heaven. The first journey is to neglect the law of the flesh, the second is to adhere to the law of the spirit, the third is to see the great Spirit. Whence the prophetic word says elegantly enough—' Rise, shine, Jerusalem ! ' The first (thing) is to rise up ; afterwards to receive light. The soul lies on the pallet of conscience, overcome with sleepy inactivity. If it wishes to shine, it rises, and so the glory of the Lord is oriented. So, my brothers, ye begin to run, casting aside the world with its own ; ye are come to the desert since the Lord is not in a commotion ; ye are come to the desert that ye may see the hissing of fine gold !

---

[1] *Supra,* p. 198.

[2] Martène and Durand, i. 192.

Ye are come to the desert not that ye may cleave to riches, but that ye may fight with sin ; ye are come into the desert since Jesus was led by the Spirit into the wilderness. Ye have fled from the crowd, and Christ fled, lest they should make Him king. Ye have fled, but the enemy follows. Fly until the enemy ceases. The flight does not end until life ends. There is not in the world a place so deep below the earth, so high above the mountains, so hidden in a wood, so encircled by the sea, to which sin cannot come. There is not a cell so enclosed but that sin can approach. Whence Seneca says 'Although ye cross the waste of the sea, although ye leave the cities of the earth, sins follow you wherever you go.' Is the hermit alone in his cell ? Sin lies outside the door, seeking a lodging with an alluring address. 'I,' she says, 'am your beloved whom ye cherished in the world, who came with thee to the table, who slept with you in your little bed, without whom you did nothing. Why have you done this wrong that you wish to leave me ? I have followed your footsteps, and do you think to hide without me in a cell ? I hold the bond [1] of your father Adam, signed by your hand. That charter is death to which you subscribed while you sinned. I am not proud, I am not disdainful, I was with you in the world, when you ate meat, when you drank wine, when you [2] satisfied yourself to excess. I shall be with you in the desert when you feed on bread only, when you taste water, when after moderate feeding, you still remain hungry. I was with you when you were in a crowd, when you slept on fine linen. I shall be with you when you think you are alone in your retreat, when you lie down in your hair-shirt. Not only is purple in hell, not only silk, but the hair-shirt and perchance wool. You have chosen rather to descend into hell with sack-cloth and ashes, with a large tonsure and great hunting boots,[3] as if by such things reverence may be offered there, than crimped, beautified, bathed, and satisfied with elegant food. You have a certain hermitage of mine. The flesh which you bear is my sister. She was born with me, suckled with me. Do you want to die without me ? So long as the flesh is flesh, so long shall I be in thy flesh. When flesh ceases to be flesh, it shall be liberated from my demands. Behold I knock at the door. Open ! flesh to thy beloved. Why are you within and I without ? ' So flatters sin, and such patronage it offers to its cause. The anchoret receives sin forsooth with magnificent hospitality, and so it frequently visits its host. But if sin is received with a sad face, it does not come so often into the cell. Here is the only guest whom Christ orders to be shut out, to whom no one ought to show a joyful face. If you conquer the flesh by abstinence with the proud—here is sin. If you are conquered by the flesh, so that you fall into pleasure—here is sin. Perchance you have not the human sins—luxury, lust.[1] Beware the diabolical. Pride is the sin common to demons and hermits. If demons were (not) wanting in this sin, it is clear that hermits will not rise above it. What therefore shall the hermit do, lest sin can enter through some fissure? He must have a dog at the door of the cell which shall constantly bark against sin, lest while he sleeps the thief is able to enter the house. That dog is the invocation of grace, that barking-dog is attentive prayer, which forbids the pure heart to sleep. The dog is faith in grace alone. The apostle had this dog when he said 'I know nothing by myself, yet am I not hereby justified' (1 Cor. iv. 4). The apostle also praised this saying, 'Pray without ceasing' (1 Thess. v. 17). When this dog barks wrong flies. I do not advise that you trust in yourselves as Julian[2] the heretic exhorted the virgin Demetrias. 'There are,' he said, 'lawful fundamentals of warfare, that a celibate may know his own strength, and that sort is most valuable in exhorting an army, which warns every soldier concerning his own strength.' I think otherwise. The fundamentals of Christian warfare are that each may know his own weakness, and wholly leaning on grace, he may know that he can do nothing by his own strength, save evil. This is the pillar of those who struggle, this is the only consolation of the fallen—to venture nothing in himself, but all in grace. Therefore grace, seeing the weakness of those who fight, and the greatness of the danger, cries 'Fly from the middle of Babylon, and let each save his soul.' The hand bold for battle seeks flight with the timid, since it is better to escape by flying, than to be conquered by resisting. The warfare of God is different from the warfare of the world. In the warfare of the world flight is called[3] disgraceful. In the warfare of God flight is praised as industry. Why do you fear to fly when your Emperor says 'Fly!'—'Fly from the middle of Babylon.' In Babylon is the beginning, the middle, the end. The beginning of Babylon is suggestion, the middle of Babylon is pleasure, the end of Babylon is labour. He does not say 'Fly from the beginning of Babylon,' since no one can avoid being tempted, and where there is no suggestion there is no battle. So without a conflict there is no victory, and where there is no victory there is no crown. And so suggestion tempts that the triumph may receive the conqueror. He does not say 'Fly from the neighbourhood of Babylon,' since he who has fallen in duty is already wounded, has already broken his legs, is already crippled. He who is crippled by broken legs can be carried, he cannot fly. But 'Fly from the middle of Babylon,' so he can openly say 'Fly pleasure and suggestion will not harm, fly pleasure and action will not begin.' If indeed he flies from the second, the first will be in vain, and the third will not follow. And, again, 'Save your souls' (Jer. xlviii. 6). We saved our souls in baptism, afterwards we lost them; we save them again in the baptism of penance. Souls are saved by grace. They are saved again by grace and labour. Grace offers itself, but desires that we shall approach. God helps us, but desires that we may work with Him. 'Ye are workers together with God,' said the apostle. So therefore ye shall save again your souls, that ye may help God in your salvation. Ye are come to the desert. To come to the desert is progress, but when ye are in the desert, not to live according to the desert, is decline. Ye have mounted the cross with the Lord, but take care lest ye come down from the cross with the left-hand thief. It is good to be crucified with the Lord, but it is best to be completed in the Lord. On the cross are many, but not for Christ. They are on the cross, but they descend into hell. Therefore ascend the cross of Christ for the sake of Christ. The cause of Christ is right. The work of Christ the Saviour is to bear what is adverse and not to do it. Work! but let the cause of the work be Christ. Sweat! since the bloody sweat of Christ will cool your sweat. Give your life to Him from whom ye received life, who indeed demands something, that He may have reasons for rewarding. Ye are not a leaf in the face of the wind. The leaf which the wind seizes is not rooted in the tree. He whom pride lifts up has no abode in the tree of life. 'Narrow is the bed,' he says, so that the other falls out, and the small coverlet is no use for both. The bed is the blessing of God, in which God sweetly rests with those obedient to Him. In this bed the devil wishes to recline through pride, and to have as great a part as God. But narrow is the bed, so that the other falls, since although Divinity receives many to be made like God, He receives no one to be equal with God. And the other falls. Whoever the other may be, he is relinquished. The other is he who is not one with God; he who adheres to God is one in spirit. Therefore he who does not adhere is 'the other.' He desires unity, and God refuses otherness,[1] since conjunction is in unity, and division is in otherness. So the bed of blessedness is [2] sufficient for one, but so narrow that it does not open to another, and the small coverlet cannot open to both. What is the small coverlet save charity, which is an element of the goodness of small things, in which all the members of perfection are enclosed. The blessed Isaiah calls charity the garment of praise, which Christ wore, since He is to be praised, who by charity alone acts well. The coverlet cannot cover both, since charity cannot bind together the humble and the proud. These, most beloved, we have fashioned for you with a hasty hand, and charity, which was latently fervid, did not blush to be prolix in words. Farewell.[1]

---

[1] 'chyrographum.' *Cf.* Optatus of Milevia (Migne, II, 1007a); Augustine, *Confessions*, ix. 11 ; *Sermo* 237, 1 ; 'Epis.' 190, 23.

[2] Martène and Durand, i. 193.

[3] 'cothurnis.'

---

[1] 'castrimargia,' a woodcock (?).

[2] This should be 'Pelagius.'

[3] Martène and Durand, i. 194.

---

[1] 'alternitatem recusat.'

[2] Martène and Durand, i. 195.

If Berengar makes no allusion in this long and beautiful epistle to his own controversy, or to his enemies, that was because no reference to the current dispute of the time would have been fitting in a letter of advice to hermits. But the high spiritual tone and mellow wisdom of his monitions are the fruit of his own chastened outlook, matured by the calm and humble life of prayer and alms-giving which he was now living at Côme. With few wants of his own, he gave away the bulk of his possessions to the poor.[2] A late report says that he made some attempt to obey Gregory's injunction to reconvert those who had been misled by him, but that his old scholars were too widely scattered to enable him to succeed.[3] But of this there is no reliable evidence. Nor is there any conclusive evidence that he had surrendered his own convictions on the eucharistic question; but when he died on the Feast of the Epiphany, 1088,[4] he passed away in the odour of sanctity after a long life of perfect health.[5] It is reported that shortly before his death he said that the Lord Jesus had appeared to him, as a sign that glory was laid up for him on account of his penitence, but he none the less feared punishment for his sins.[6] Thoughts of the Epiphany were clearly passing through his mind at the time. They buried him in the cathedral church of S. Martin at Tours, but Hildebert, Archbishop of Tours, an old pupil of Berengar, exhumed his body and reburied it in the Priory of S. Côme. Every year in Easter week the canons of S. Martin's conducted a memorial service at his tomb, chanting the 'De Profundis,' a Paternoster with Versicles, and offering up prayers. Above his tomb they placed an epitaph composed by Hildebert:

---

[1] Martène and Durand, i. 196.

[2] Malmesbury, *G.R.*, 339. *Cf.* 'Epis. of Alexander II to Geoffrey of Anjou' (Bishop, p. 274).

[3] Higden (Rolls Ser. vii. 210).

[4] *Necrology of Cath. Eccles. Andeg.* (Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. ii. 66); *Chron. Turon.* (Bouq., xii. 467; Mabillon, *ibid.* 63; Salmon, p. 427). *Cf.* Nobilleau, *Bull. soc. archéol. Touraine*, iv. 276. The epitaph of Hildebert gives January 5 (*Chron. Turon.*, Bouq., xii. 465). The *Hist. Litt.*, viii. 214, probably correctly harmonises the two reports by suggesting the night of January 5–6. Bernold, *Chron.* (*Mon. Ger. SS.*, v. 439; Migne, 148, 1383a), gives wrongly 1083 as the year, an error which is repeated by Oudin, ii. 638.

[5] We read of no sickness undergone by him, and the fine state of preservation of his teeth in 1752 indicates sound health at the end (*cf. infra*, p. 210).

[6] *Cf.* Malmesbury, *G.R.*, 339, and Higden (Rolls Ser. vii. 210). The *Chron. Sithiensis* (Bouq., xi. 382b) and Bromton (Twysden, p. 952) say that he foretold his end. Cf. *Chron. Bertini* (Martène and Durand, ii. 578).

> Quem modo miratur, semper mirabitur orbis,
> Ille Berengarius non obiturus obiit.
> Quem sacrae fidei vestigia summa tenentem,
> Jam quinta dies abstulit ausa nefas, etc.[1]

Hildebert concludes his eulogium by avowing that he desires no better end than to share eternity with Berengar.[2] Another epitaph was written by Baudry, Abbot of Bourgueil, and later Bishop of Dol:

> Tota Latinorum facundia marcida floret
> Berengario Turoni floruere magistro.[3]

At Angers they inserted his name in the Necrology of the cathedral church of S. Maurice:

VIII Idus Januarii obiit Berengarius istius ecclesiae archidiaconus.[4]

The tomb was attacked by Huguenots in 1562,[5] who left the coffin uncovered. De Champcourt found it in this condition in 1752, although the large slate had been replaced on the tomb. The stone coffin measured less than five and a half feet. The skull had been broken into pieces, but the teeth were intact, and were finer and larger than those found in neighbouring tombs. Earth was mingled with the bones, and de Champcourt placed some of them in a little recess in the wall on the left of the entry of the Chapel of S. Côme. No parchment containing a profession of faith was found, but as the coffin had often been inundated by the water of the Loire, it had probably perished. The large slate on the tomb was bigger than that on neighbouring graves.[1]

---

[1] Nobilleau, *Bull. Soc. archéol. Touraine*, iv. 277. Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 67, reports the tradition that he was buried in the cloister of S. Côme, at the door of the chapter-house, beneath a black stone (*cf. supra*, text), where the canons of S. Martin's met every year on the 3rd Feria of Easter to sing the 'De Profundis,' without collect or prayer or mention of his name. The story was examined and rejected by Maan, p. 86 f. He says that if it records a fact it must refer to some other member of the community who died in disgrace. The *Hist. Litt.*, viii. 216, accepts this account. Brossier, *Rev. des prov. de l'Ouest* (1857), p. 88, says that every Easter Day the ceremony took place at the tomb of Berengar, and that they prayed for his soul. He obtained his information from documents burned at S. Maurice, Angers, in 1793 (p. 86). This annual service took place until 1757. *Cf.* Moleon, *Voyages liturgiques de France* (1757), p. 129 f., quoted by Stäudlin, ii. 91 n. 135.

[2] De Roye, p. 84.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 15 f.; *Hist. Litt.*, viii. 217.

[4] Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 66.

[5] Nobilleau, *Bull. Soc. archéol. Touraine*, iv. 277.

Laudatory notices of Berengar were natural at Tours and Angers, where, even at the height of the controversy, he had always possessed friends. But tributes to his catholicity were soon forthcoming from distant parts, the result of nearly a decade of submission beneath the wing of the Papacy. The monk Clarius, a member of the Abbey of Fleury, near Sens, wrote ten years after his death that 'he finished his life as a faithful and true Catholic.'[2] Richard of Poitiers, a monk at Cluny, a contemporary writer, reports that 'he erred in the faith, but afterwards corrected his error.[3] William of Malmesbury, the leading English historian of the next century, records that although he had erred in youth he was regarded as a saint when he came to graver years.[4] The anonymous chronicler of Mœlk reports that, although not convicted at heart, he made the usual statement of Catholic belief in the Sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord and Saviour, and confirmed it in some versicles.

Constat in altari carnem de pane creari
Ipsa caro Deus est ; qui negat hoc reus est.[5]

Modern writers hold divided opinions on the point.[6] But

---

[1] *Cf.* the letter of de Champcourt to Dom. Gerou of the Abbey of Marmoutier, dated August 16, 1752, quoted by Nobilleau, p. 277 f. Yet Vaucelle, p. 349 n. 2, contends that Nobilleau has produced no evidence for the translation in the time of Hildebert.

[2] *Chronicon S. Petri Vivi. Senonensis* (Bouq., xii. 279d) ; d'Achery, *Spicilegium*, ii. 476.

[3] *Hist. Litt.*, viii. 215.

[4] Rolls Series, p. 339.

[5] Migne, 213, 979a. *Cf.* also *Chron. Turon.* (Bouq., xii. 461d) ; *Chron. Sithiensis* (Bouq., xi. 382b) ; Higden, vii. 208.

[6] For the conversion of Berengar : Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 63–68 ; *Vet. Analecta*, p. 515 ff. ; Bouq., xi. 531 ; *Hist. Litt.*, viii. 216 ; Du Boulay, i. 459 ; Natalis Alexander, vi. 674b–c ; de Roye, p. 80 ; Rieberer, xxi. 89 n. 78 ; Döllinger, *Lehrbuch* (1843), i. 378 ; de Crozals, p. 90 ; Biginelli, p. 20.

His conversion is denied or is regarded as doubtful by Oudin, ii. 636 f. ;

there is no sufficient reason for doubting the statement of Bernold that he abjured the recantation of 1079.[1] While during the last years of his life Berengar was scrupulous to give no further offence to Catholic sentiment or belief, there can be little doubt that the interpretation of the Eucharist which he had held for over forty years, for which he was condemned at fourteen synods and councils,[2] and which he reaffirmed in his final polemical work after the Roman Council of 1079, was the faith in which he died. If the couplet assigned to him by the *Chronicon de Mœlk* is genuine, then we must hold that this concession to orthodox phraseology would have been readily explained away by him if he had been pressed—that was his method all through the dispute. The conflict was over ideas, not words. So uncertain is the exact meaning of some of his statements that orthodox writers have divided upon another point—did he deny the real presence as well as Transubstantiation? Some of the most catholic of writers have decided in his favour on the question of the real presence.[3] Others have maintained that he denied both,[4] and some writers have charged him with the grossest

---

Schröckh, xxiii. 551 ff.; Lessing, p. 170 ff.; Stäudlin, ii. 90; Neander, vi. 334; Ampère, iii. 356; Romano, *Dizionario*, p. 131; Sudendorf, p. 198 f.; Reuter, i. 127; Schwabe, pp. 91, 128; Schnitzer, p. 121 f.; Hauck-Herzog, ii. 611; Ébersolt, p. 160 f. Alger (d. *c.* 1131) refers to him as a 'heretic' (Hurter, xxiii. 218, 221).

[1] Bernold, *Chron.* (*M.G.H.*, v. 439; Migne, 148, 1383a).

[2] Rome, Brionne, and Vercelli (1050); Tours and Paris (1051); Tours (1054); Rouen and Florence (1055); Rome (1059); Angers (1062); Poitiers (1075); Rome (1078 and 1079); Bordeaux (1080).

[3] Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 36: 'He denied Transubstantiation, but taught the real presence.' *Ibid.* xxvii.: His doctrine was really impanation. *Cf.* Vernet (Vacant and Mangenot, v. 1218). Lessing, p. 176 ff.: He taught the real presence, but not impanation. The following also maintain that while he denied Transubstantiation he taught the real presence: Martène and Durand, iv. 102; Ceillier, xx. 295; Gfrörer, *Greg. VII*, vi. 612; de Crozals, p. 88; Gore, *Dissertations*, p. 255 ff.; *Body of Christ*, p. 116.

[4] Natalis Alexander, vi. 663; Stäudlin, ii. 94; Schwane, p. 637; Schnitzer, p. 300; Morin, *Dict. de Phil. et Théol. Scolastique*, i. 552; Héfélé-Leclercq, iv. pt. ii. 1174 n.; Rénaudin, p. 431; Emil Michael, *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie*, xviii. (1894), 526 (Michael mistakenly says that Lessing charges Berengar with the doctrine of impanation); Migne, *Troisième Encyclopédie Théologique* (1856), p. 21; Pletteau, pp. 16, 60; Biginelli, p. 19; Vernet (Vacant and Mangenot, ii. 729). But Vernet says (col. 731 ff.) that Berengar's *language* supports the real presence. The *Hist. Litt.*, viii. 234, concludes that his principles are not consistent.

prevarication and the clearest deceit.[1] From his writings it is evident that his interpretation of the Eucharist was completely free from the materialistic conceptions common to writers of that age. If the charge of prevarication is to be considered, it lies rather against his adversaries. There are passages in their writings, especially in those of Lanfranc,[2] where the spiritual interpretation of the doctrine is couched in terms almost as lofty as those of Berengar, but they nullify these phrases in their teaching when they come to explain the meaning of their words.

If Berengar occasionally used language which seemed to embody some of the current orthodox conceptions, he seldom failed to explain his meaning in spiritual terms. The evangelical thought was ever present to his mind: 'The words I say unto you, they are spirit, they are life, the flesh profiteth nothing.' When in the *De Sacra Cœna* he claims that the physical-realism of Paschasius and Lanfranc was execrated by the greater part of the Church,[3] he gave way to exaggeration. In the Benedictine houses, which were the nurseries of at least one-half of the clergy of the day, the teaching of Paschasius in one form or another was predominant, and the Paschasian realism had been used to heighten the materialistic teaching of the Mass-cultus, so that the illiterate worshippers were helplessly under its influence. Yet Berengar's was not a solitary voice crying aloud. In Paschasius' time, even in the Benedictine monasteries, strong opposition to Paschasius' teaching was to be found, and this attitude, forcibly represented then by Ratramn, was preserved right down to Berengar's era,[4] especially in cathedral schools like Tours. Down to 1050, at least, Berengar was supported by the best of the clergy at Tours.

The dispute with Lanfranc was largely a dispute between seculars and regulars, between the old cathedral schools and the new Benedictine theology, and the wide-spread opposition

[1] *Cf.* Reuter, i. 125; Schnitzer, p. 123 f.; Ébersolt, p. 161.

[2] *Cf.* Migne, 150, 429b, 434a–b, 438d.

[3] P. 54: 'quam plurimos vel pene infinitos esse cujuscumque ordinis et dignitatis, qui tuum de sacrificio ecclesiae execrentur errorem atque Pascasii.' *Cf.* p. 115 f.

[4] *Infra*, p. 246 ff.

to the teaching of Paschasius and Lanfranc to which Berengar appeals probably represents their attitude, although it was not so extensive as he claims. So also the four schools of Berengarian thought, described by Guitmund,[1] should probably be explained on the same grounds. If his teaching spread from France to Belgium and Germany, and even to Italy,[2] yet it created no organised following for him in those lands, but was sympathetically received by theologians who were still under the influence of the Augustinian-Ratramnian doctrine, by thoughtful men who exist widely in all ages, and to whom the crude realism of Radbert and Humbert was an offence to common sense, and who had not come under the influence of the dogmatic teaching of the new Benedictine revival.

If Berengar had a clearly perceptible following in his own day, and on into the twelfth century,[3] he created no sect. His old scholars did not succeed in converting a single little town or even village in France.[4] If Berengarianism never reached the dimensions of a schism, three causes co-operated to prevent this development, which at one time appeared probable. Firstly, Berengar was a student and a man of letters. He was not an organiser, and beyond the qualifications needed to maintain and popularise a great cathedral school, he had no capacity for leading men, or even for rallying them to his standard. Secondly, the future lay with the realists, and the capture of the Benedictine houses made the victory of a modified Radbertian doctrine a certainty. Thirdly, the message of Berengar was rather for the clergy and monks, and even among them it appealed only to the learned. For the 'mob' of illiterate priests and monks he always maintained the greatest contempt.[1] Any movement for the reform of dogma must indeed begin with the theologians. It must be disseminated in the study. Until it has established itself there, little opportunity is open for its publication to the masses. The success of the Reformation was due in the first instance to the literary work of Luther, and to the spread of the movement among the theologians and thinkers of north-western Europe. In the early Middle Ages the attempt to popularise a spiritual interpretation of the Eucharist was met by the barrier set up by the Mass-cultus, by increasing refinements in ritual, by the development of the legends which were used through the medium of preaching to emphasise the actual presence of the body of Christ on the altar. The crude materialism of some of these stories [2] made impossible a lofty spiritual devotion in the minds of simple, illiterate worshippers, whether noble or peasant. In days when men have not been trained to think—and the medieval Roman Church discouraged independent thought—only those ideas which are presented through the senses have any chance of being permanently absorbed. This has been the weakness of the sacramental theory from the beginning. Yet it cannot be abandoned, and the words of institution sanction it, but when divorced from the attendant evangelical principle 'The words I say unto you, they are spirit, they are life,' the theory defeats its own end, and instead of raising human life up to the level of God, it buries the divine in the body of materialism and leaves religion grovelling in the dust of earth.

---

[1] Hurter, xxxviii. 12 f.; *cf.* p. 176.

[2] *Infra*, p. 395.

[3] Guitmund (Hurter, xxxviii. 12 f.); Lanfranc (Migne, 150, 545d) refers to Berengarian schismatics at Poitiers (*cf.* 543d); Peter the Venerable, Abbot of Cluny, d. 1138 (Migne, 189, 789a), and Gregory of Bergamo (Hurter, xxxix. 2) refer to Berengarian heretics. But Peter the Venerable may be referring to Berengar of Gévaudan (*cf.* N. Peyrat, *Les Reformateurs de la France et de l'Italie au douzième siècle* (1860), p. 367 ff.). Stäudlin, ii. 31, thinks that Berengar endeavoured to create a party. On the contrary, Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 55; Schwabe, p. 130 n. 2; Rénaudin, p. 444; and Ébersolt, pp. 157, 179.

[4] Guitmund (Hurter, xxxviii. 161): 'neque enim eis vel una civitatula vel etiam una villula concessit.' *Ibid.* 166: 'Berengariam plebeculam.' Pletteau, p. 29, says that he sent out his disciples to counteract the effect of the decisions of the Councils. The *Revue Bénédictine*, xx. (1903) 97, suggests that his disciples never numbered more than 300.

The story of Berengarianism illustrates the fate which overtakes ideas when unsupported by a dominant personality for their publication. Berengar was not a Luther. His temperament was not qualified for the rough-and-tumble of life among ambitious churchmen, who place expediency before principle and lose no opportunity of advancing themselves by crowding to the wall the men of scholarship and thought. His personal influence was exerted rather in the class-room than the council-chamber. Before the shallow but confident criticism of zealots like Humbert, or experienced pleaders like Lanfranc, he was unable to make an impression. That his ideas made an appeal when quietly considered is proved by the attitude of Hildebrand, and by the long list of distinguished clergy who were counted among his friends. But he had no force of personality sufficient to impress the minds of adversaries. Within his smaller academic sphere, in the presence of the generous open-mindedness of young men when listening to intellectual genius, the spirit of Berengar felt no restraint. Here was he master of himself. Here could he successfully plant his teaching and draw the love of those who listened.

---

[1] Schnitzer, p. 59, misunderstands Berengar's allusions to the 'mob.' He means the illiterate monks and clergy or the members of the Councils, not simple lay-folk. The following passages are quoted by Schnitzer from the *D.S.C.*, pp. 33, 35, 44, 49, 52, 53, 54, 55, 59, 63, 72, 81, 107, 116, 127, 132, 174, 182, 187, 189, 228, 229, 234; from Sudendorf, pp. 209, 210, 211, 212, 231; from the 'Epis. to Adelmann' (Martène and Durand, iv. 111); from the *Acta Concilii Rom.* (Martène and Durand, iv. 103, 108). Some of these passages, viz. *D.S.C.*, pp. 54, 55, 107, 127, 132, show clearly that Berengar referred to the clergy.

[2] *Infra*, p. 250 ff.

In addition to his views on the Eucharist, Berengar has been charged with several other heretical conceptions. It was alleged that he denied the efficacy of infant baptism and the indissolubility of marriage, that he denied the Virgin-birth and the palpability of the Resurrection-body of Christ. But his teaching on baptism in the letter to the hermits [1] and in the *De Sacra Cœna*,[2] his warning letter to Philip of France against adultery,[3] and his advice to Eusebius Bruno on the marriage of widows,[4] dispose of the allegations of Theoduin,[5] who records a mere rumour that Berengar was unsound on these matters.

The charge that Berengar denied the doctrine of the Virgin-birth [6] has arisen through a misunderstanding of his views on the ninth-century dispute on the nature of the birth of Christ. In Germany, according to Ratramn, the curious view was expressed that Mary gave birth to Jesus by means of a miracle analogous to the traditional creation of Eve.[1] This idea Ratramn entirely repudiated, and stated the Catholic doctrine.[2] At the close of the *De Sacra Cœna* Berengar discussed this question. He refers to the letter of Pope Hormisdas (514–523) to Justin Augustus, in which the Pope stated that the Son of God was born as a man, without violating his mother's virginity. He then quotes S. Luke's statement that Mary conceived and brought forth a son, and asks whether it is not stupid to interpret the evangelist's words according to the old-wives' tale that Christ was born through his mother's ribs or by a similar process. A further quotation from S. Luke follows, and the passage breaks off, for the end of the *De Sacra Cœna* has been destroyed.[3] That Berengar had in mind the heresy condemned by Ratramn is clear from the similarity of his terminology,[4] and it is curious that neither Schnitzer [5] nor Geiselmann [6] noticed this before they accused him of heresy on the Virgin-birth. In his discussion on the pseudo-Ambrosian and Augustinian comparison between the body of Christ born of a Virgin, and the sacramental body, Berengar gives no hint that he was unsound on this doctrine.[7]

---

[1] *Supra*, p. 207.

[2] Pp. 150 f., 153 f., 157 f. *Cf.* his opposition to rebaptism, *ibid.* pp. 27, 34, 39, 44, 48, 58.

[3] *Supra*, p. 177 ff.

[4] Bishop, p. 275.

[5] *Supra*, p. 85. Possibly Berengar fell under suspicion through Eusebius' correspondence with Humbert.

[6] Geiselmann, *Studien*, pp. 78 f., 81; Schnitzer, p. 308; Abbaud (Migne, 166, 1344b).

The allegation that Berengar refused S. John's statement concerning the appearance of Christ to the disciples when the doors were shut, is based upon stronger contemporary testimony,[8] although nothing appears to support it in his own writings. It is possible that Berengar, who criticised unspiritual views of the Resurrection-body of Christ, may have denied that after the Resurrection His physical body passed through closed doors to the disciples; but the statements of Eusebius Bruno and Wolfelm need prove no more than that Berengar emphasised S. Paul's teaching on the spiritual nature of the Resurrection-body.[1]

---

[1] Migne, 121, 83a, 87a.

[2] Ratramn (Migne, 121, 84c, 86c–d).

[3] This and other passages are quoted in full in my article in the *Journal of Theological Studies* (April 1929), p. 291 ff.

[4] *Cf.* Ratramn (Migne, 121, 86d–87a) with Berengar, *D.S.C.*, p. 290.

[5] P. 308.

[6] *Studien*, pp. 78, 81. Rückert, p. 526, makes a similar mistake. The heresy on the Virgin-birth was current in Berengar's time. *Cf.* the pseudo-*Confessio* of Alcuin (Migne, 101, 1090c) assigned by Geiselmann to this era.

[7] *D.S.C.*, pp. 186 f., 262.

[8] Wolfelm, 'Epistle' (*Mon. Ger. SS.*, xii. 185; Migne, 154, 412d); Eusebius Bruno, 'Epis. to Berengar' (Migne, 147, 1203b), but Eusebius may be referring to the general statement attributed to Berengar in the letter of Geoffrey to Hildebrand (Sudendorf, p. 218); Guitmund (Hurter, xxxviii. 147); Abbaud (Migne, 166, 1344b) and the pseudo-*Confessio* of Alcuin, now attributed to the time of Peter Damiani (d. *c.* 1070). *Cf.* Geiselmann, *Studien*, p. 78 ff. The passage appears in Migne, 101, 1090b. It refers to 'some' who deny that Christ passed through closed doors to the disciples, and that Christ walked on the sea, and was born of a

On the doctrine of grace, his letter to the hermits presents one of the clearest statements of the orthodox teaching among medieval writers. Avoiding at once the Predestination theory of Augustine and the Free-will doctrine of Pelagius, he presents the doctrine of grace in the tone of Cassian and Faustus of Rhegium—'Co-operate with God for your salvation.'[2]

In all matters of practical morality and ecclesiastical discipline Berengar supported the Cluniac-Hildebrandine reforms,[3] although only once does he hint at one of the abuses against which the reforms were directed.[4] By instinct and by nature he was a man to whom the policy of the reformers was obviously right, and needed no statement from him for its furtherance. This gave him great credit with moderate and practical minds like Alexander II and Gregory VII, although men like Berengar, whose sympathies were with the movement, but who avoided trenchant proclamation of it, were not so few as might be supposed. In every era of reform there is a large body of silent men who occupy a central and non-vocal position, and whose interests are frequently abandoned by reformers and reactionaries. Even in the eucharistic controversy we do not read that Berengar demanded recognition for his views, save when compelled by direct attack to state them. His correspondence is mainly occupied with the affairs of his friends. The elements of the Berengarian eucharistic doctrine could not be reconstructed from his letters, save from the three early epistles

---

Virgin. These three topics were treated together more than once. *Cf.* Radbert (Migne, 120, 1367–1386, and especially 1382b–d), so that a suspicion of heresy on one point suggested heresy on all three.

[1] *Cf.* 'Epis. of Geoffrey to Hildebrand' (Sudendorf, p. 218) attributed to Berengar (*supra*, p. 126).

[2] *Cf.* Berengar to the hermits (*supra*, p. 207).

[3] *Cf.* Schwabe, p. 118.

[4] *Supra*, p. 168.

to Ansfroi, Ascelin, and Adelmann, which dealt specifically with the question. The same disinterestedness is apparent in his attitude to the great and powerful men among whom he moved. No single letter has been preserved appealing for the support of kings and barons.[1] He preferred to have his case judged by the authorities of his Church. He was indifferent to the attitude of the lay-magnates.[2] On the contrary, when they applied to him, even when his interests seemed to demand compliance with them, he did not fail to rebuke them for their weakness or selfishness. The letters to King Philip and Odo of Bayeux are models of polite but honest integrity. They were but the manifestations of his own inner life. No breath of slander was ever uttered against him, save against his charity, and that was vindicated by the supreme Pontiff.[3] To tenacity of purpose, as real as that of Lanfranc, he added the kindly consideration of Anselm. He was the prince of schoolmasters of that age. Even Lanfranc's success as a preceptor was criticised by Anselm, and the latter erred on the side of indulgence.[4] Young men were sent to Berengar from all parts of Europe, and even the writers of legend of a succeeding age could not conceal his popularity as a teacher.

All these qualities serve partly to explain his bitter polemic against Humbert and Lanfranc. He makes no reference to the writings of Durand and Guitmund, possibly because they had not overstepped the limits of controversial courtesy. Their terminology and method merited the respect of another scholar and man of letters. But in Humbert and Lanfranc he saw not only the arch-schemers of a selfish reactionary policy, possessed of a zeal which did not comprehend the implications of that which they criticised, or the trend of their own views, and was ready to sacrifice all new manifestations of truth, all exercise of reason in support of things as they were, to ensure a clear pathway for their own progress—but controversialists who began with abuse and ended with the hard intransigeance of the Roman formulae of 1059 and 1079. So Berengar came into the lists with the sword of the pen, and smote these foemen with the full weight of an indignation which was not stirred by other men.

---

[1] Reuter, i. 113, and Schnitzer's account (p. 60) are to be received with caution. It is not clear that Berengar maintained the extensive correspondence suggested by these writers. The letter to Richard (*supra*, p. 90 f.) asks merely for justice from Henry I.

[2] *Cf.* Malmesbury, *G.R.*, p. 339. He did not flatter the rich (Hildebert in de Roye, p. 83).

[3] 'Epis. of Alexander II' (Bishop, p. 274).

[4] *Cf.* my *Lanfranc*, p. 175 ff.

In greatness of moral indignation Berengar has never been surpassed. It was his one great passion, and if it frequently swept him away from the restraints of sober utterance and broke his reasoned argument into shafts of disconnected polemic, who shall say that the inspiration was ignoble? When we estimate his contribution to the progress of the Evangelical principle, we shall find it not so much in the appeal to Scripture as the final authority for belief—although he never loses an opportunity to quote the Bible—but in the demand for freedom whereby the individual may open the books of Scripture and there judge for himself the meaning of God's Word. The Evangelical principle of the freedom of private judgment was originated in the Middle Ages by Berengar. But he did not uphold a mere appeal to the letter of Scripture—that was more frequently adopted by writers on the other side. Berengar saw that the final test lay in the interpretation, and that that must be made with the assistance of reason, which in turn was a divinely inspired faculty.[1]

Yet Berengar is not to be numbered among the great scholastics, still less among the founders of Nominalism.[2] If the influence of Aristotle can be traced in his thought, he owed far more to the Neo-Platonists,[3] and certainly no systematisation of theology by the aid of Aristotelean categories can be found in his writings. Only if the term 'scolasticism' be stretched backwards, so as to include the earlier application of dialectics or reason to the interpretation of Scripture, can he be included among the scholastics, but some authorities dispute this broad usage of the term.[4] His teaching was too loosely held together to be included within any of the scholastic systems. But in the appeal to private judgment, and in the claim to use it as an instrument of exegesis, he heralded the epoch when Evangelicalism should be able to equip the ordinary man not only with the text of Scripture but with a method of understanding it for himself.[1]

---

[1] *Infra*, p. 302 f.

[2] *Cf.* J. Reiners, *Der Nominalismus in der Frühscholastik* (*Beiträge*, 1910, viii. 5–59); Ébersolt, p. 173 ff.

[3] *Infra*, p. 329.

[4] Loofs, *Leitfaden*, p. 153 f.: 'Scholasticism dates from Peter Lombard'; W. H. V. Reade, *Camb. Med. Hist.*, v. 795 ff., 804.

In the next century the name of Berengar was used to illustrate crude ideas of demoniacal possession, and as an excuse for further elaboration of the Mass-cultus. A Berengarian legend developed. The Scolasticus was charged with dabbling in necromancy when a young man, but the clumsy romancer makes use of the story to explain why Berengar wrote the *Juste Judex*. One night the devil carried him from Tours to Rome. Here a certain boy, a clerk of noble family, was committed to his care. One day during the absence of the Scolasticus the pupil read his books on necromancy, and was killed by the devil. On his return Berengar compelled the demon to enter the body of the dead boy, so that he walked about and sang with the others in the choir, until a rival necromancer exposed the fraud and showed that the boy was really dead. Berengar was then condemned to death, but taking refuge in a church he composed the *Juste Judex*, and, singing it with lamentation, was set free by divine intervention.[2]

His doctrine was condemned again at the Synod of Placentia in 1095 [3] and possibly at the Council of Clermont in the same year.[1] His teaching has been associated with that of the Petrobrusiani, Albigenses, Cathari, and Waldenses.[2] But no historical connection between Berengar and these sectaries can be established.

---

[1] For a criticism of Berengar's character, *cf*. Reuter, i. 125 f. ; Schwabe, p. 128 f. ; Schnitzer, p. 122 ff.

[2] An interpolation in the *Chron*. of Alberic of the Three Fountains (*Mon. Ger. SS*., xxiii. 789). The story is inserted at the end of another passage taken from Sigebert of Gembloux. Natalis Alexander (*Historia Eccles*., vi. 662) quotes three old MSS. for this legend—*Lauriacensis*, the *Chron*. of William Niangiacus or Nanglaucus, and the *Chron. Magni Belgici*. It is repeated by Polydore Virgil in his *Historiae Anglicanae*, lib. ix. (edition 1651, Leyden), p. 213. The charge of necromancy also appears in the *Chron. Turon*. (Bouq., xii. 461b). *Cf*. de Roye, p. 18. Another version of this legend is given by the untrustworthy writer Maffre, i. 29–37. The title ' magician ' was also bestowed on Gerbert. He was a magician in knowledge. On the Berengarian legend, *cf*. Rieberer, xxi. 39, 50, and Ébersolt, p. 27.

[3] Bernold, *Chron*. (*M.G.H*., v. 462 ; Migne, 148, 1423d) ; Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. ii., Praef. 33 ; *Annales*, v. 344 ; Bouq., xi. 28b ; Mansi, xx. 803c.

Some Roman Catholic writers associated the origin of Corpus Christi and the practice of the elevation of the host and chalice with attempts to obliterate all recollection of the teaching of Berengar. They regarded the annual procession at Angers—which marched through the city to the hill of S. Laurence, and in which the principal feature, besides the carrying of the host, was the bearing of twelve great torches by representatives of twelve different crafts operating in Angers—as evidence for their contention.[3] But Brossier could find no trace at Angers of any connection between Berengar and the origin of Corpus Christi, or of the procession to S. Laurence, and he had access to documents which were burned at Angers in 1793.[4] The Feast of Corpus Christi was officially started by Urban IV in 1264,[5] although no doubt Urban's bull only sanctioned a ceremony which had been practised in many parts of western Europe long before.[6] Its observance spread gradually. Durand of Mende, who wrote his *Rational* in 1284, does not mention it.[7] The processions, which became the principal feature of this feast, were not originated at the same time as the liturgical festival.

---

[1] A marginal note to Mansi, xx. 818c, commenting on the twenty-eighth canon of Clermont, which enforces reception in both kinds as a check on Berengarian heresy, says that one kind sufficiently fulfilled the symbolism. *Cf.* Biginelli, p. 31, who adds the condemnation was repeated at Bari 1098.

[2] Peter the Venerable in *Tractatus contra Petrobrusianos* (Migne, 189, 789a); P. Moiraghi, *Lanfranco da Pavia* (1889), p. 28; Ampère, iii. 362.

[3] Jean Hiretius, p. 104; de Roye, p. 4 f.; J. Corblet, ii. 392; Besse, *Prov. ecclés. Tours*, p. 67.

[4] *Cf.* the statement of G. M. Brossier printed by Marchegay (*Rev. des Prov. de l'Ouest*, v. (1857), 86 f.).

[5] De Roye, p. 5; Basnage, ii. 1264; Pletteau, pp. 19, 61; Brossier, p. 90; Corblet, ii. 370. It is reported that Urban IV was influenced by the visions of a solitary, Juliana of Mont Cornillon, through John of Lausanne (Brossier, p. 89; Corblet, pp. 371, 377).

[6] F. Uzureau, *Andegavana*, 1re série (1904), p. 84 ff., finds no proof for the procession in public in the eleventh century, but thinks that it appeared at Angers in the twelfth century. But (*ibid.* 5me série (1906), p. 421) Lanfranc and John of Avranches show that the procession was used in Benedictine houses in the eleventh century.

[7] Corblet, ii. 377.

They are not mentioned in the bull of Urban IV, nor in the office for the day composed by S. Thomas, nor in the bull of confirmation of Clement V (1305–14). Some say the procession began with John XII (1316–34), others at the time of the Council of Vienne (1311), and others at Milan or Pavia on May 29, 1404. It is mentioned at Sens in 1320, Paris in 1323, Tournai in 1325, and Chartres in 1330.[1]

That the teaching of Berengar was followed during the next two centuries by a growing cult of the Sacrament was only a natural expression of the Catholic reaction,[2] although we need not attribute to his influence the elaborate sequence of consequences drawn up recently by Biginelli.[3] Among the ceremonies which are said to have been protests against Berengar's influence are included the procession on Palm Sunday, started by Lanfranc,[4] and the elevation of the host and chalice. But Lanfranc nowhere states that the elaborate ceremony introduced by him into his Benedictine Constitutions [5] was related to the Berengarian controversy. More probably it was an attempt to emphasise liturgically the evangelic event commemorated on Palm Sunday. No reference to the elevation of the host occurs in the 'Ecclesiastical Offices' of John, Bishop of Avranches, written in 1068,[6] nor in the letter of Ivo of Chartres to Matilda, Queen of England.[7] The earliest reference to this practice is associated with Cardinal Guy, who in 1140 ordered a bell to be sounded when the host was carried abroad, so that the people might adore.[8] Again in 1203, Guy, the Cardinal-Bishop of Palestrina, when papal legate in Germany, ordered prostration at the sound of a bell immediately after the consecration of the host.[9] In

---

[1] Corblet, ii. 377. *Cf.* Darwell Stone, i. 352 ff.

[2] Basnage, ii. 1002.

[3] Report of the *Congrès scientifique internationale des Catholiques, Fribourg* (*Suisse*), *1897*, published in 1898, p. 27.

[4] Corblet, ii. 352 ; Biginelli, p. 23. *Cf. supra*, p. 221 n. 6.

[5] Migne, 150, 455c ff. *Cf.* my *Lanfranc*, p. 158 f., and Armitage Robinson, *Journal of Theological Studies*, April 1909, p. 375 ff.

[6] Migne, 147, 27 ff. [7] *Ibid.* 162, 148d ff.

[8] Arnold Wion, *Lignum Vitae*, ii. lib. v. 677, quoted by Biginelli, p. 24.

[9] Biginelli, p. 24, quoting Cesare of Heisterbach, lib. ix. cap. xli.; Ceillier, xx. 302, gives 1201 as the date. The elevation of the host is associated with Berengar's teaching by the *Journal des Scavans* (1732), p. 556. A commentary on the Roman Ordinal II, *Musaci Italici*, p. 49, says that the custom appeared in France in the middle of the eleventh

1215 the General Chapter of Clairvaux ordered the elevation of the host after consecration, and the chalice used at S. Malachi, Clairvaux, was covered with little bells, so that the same order probably applied to the chalice.[1] Vernet states that from this era dates the custom whereby bishops and doctors of the Church, at the approach of death, make an explicit confession of faith on the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist.[2] It has also been suggested that the Berengarian controversy influenced the art of the Church in the next age.[3]

When a final glance is taken over the history of the controversy, Hildebrand stands out as the deciding factor in the tragedy of Berengar's failure; and just because the range of Hildebrand's work was European and exerted a dominating influence upon the main stream of European history, the failure of Berengar reacted in the wider theatre which was the scene of Gregory VII's operations. It was unfortunate that Hildebrand paid so little heed to the development of doctrine. Otherwise he might indeed have adopted, quite early, an attitude similar to that of Humbert, though without expressing himself in the domineering terms of that typical rigorist. On the other hand, he might well have been won over to perceive the need for a purification of dogma from the Radbertian accretions, the need for an enlightenment of the whole intellectual outlook of the Church and for a development of its teaching along the more spiritual lines which John the Scot and Ratramn had attempted to lay down against the sensual and paganising interpretation which Paschasius Radbert left as a hereditas damnosa to the medieval Church. If Hildebrand in later years had been less insistent upon the consequences of Church reform, and more careful for the doctrines around which the reforms, to their bane, were wrapping themselves; if he had paid less attention to the Emperor Henry IV and more to Berengar of Tours, the great upheaval against ecclesiastical medievalism, which represented

---

century, and at Rome, again, later. The *Hist. Litt.*, viii. 238, gives hesitating consent. Vernet (Vacant and Mangenot, ii. 740) thinks the tradition is very uncertain. *Cf.* Corblet, ii. 357.

[1] Ceillier, xx. 302.

[2] Vernet (Vacant and Mangenot), ii. 740.

[3] Corblet, ii. 512, quoting Didelot, *Congrès des Œuvres eucharistiques tenu à Avignon*, 1882, p. 350.

the final revolt of Germany and the north-western nations against the politico-religious system founded by Hildebrand, might have been forestalled. In a word the Reformation might have been staged in the eleventh century without the disastrous results to the unity of Western Christendom which were inevitable five centuries later, results which necessitated the hundred years of religious wars preceding the Peace of Westphalia (1648). From the ninth century sprang the perversion of dogma which ended in the commercial travelling of Tetzel and all the huckstering of religious privileges in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.[1] From the eleventh century sprang the practical ecclesiastical system which gave these abuses a long life, and made possible their ramification into every cell of the European religious body. But in the eleventh century with the call of Berengar, a voice was heard which might have rolled back the gathering clouds. To quote his own words, repeated more than once to Lanfranc: 'A light shined in the darkness, but the darkness comprehended it not.'[2] In the spiritualising and purifying of dogma offered by the system of Berengar as a contribution to the work of the administrative and moral reformers, Hildebrand and his school might have obtained an inspirational impetus which would have kept the practical reforms in a state of healthy development, and prevented their becoming involved, and so degraded, in the political maelstrom of medieval Europe. But the day of opportunity for the medieval Papacy to become the inaugurator of spiritual as well as practical reform was allowed to pass. When it seemed to have reappeared in the fifteenth century, in the era of the Conciliar movement, it was but a fictitious dawn. The Church was too far sunk in corruption and decrepitude to arise for the reform of head and members, and the primacy of Peter passed for ever from the sphere of practical possibility. The Papacy was compelled to rest content with a Counter-Reformation which turned the Roman Church into one of the sects, or at the most into a mere Italian and therefore national interpretation of Catholicism. The eucharistic theory of Berengar—to which in later centuries the reformed Churches returned, whether they knew it or not—and indeed they did not know of his *De Sacra Cœna* until modern days—freed from some of its crudities, might have been adopted at the Fourth Lateran Council (1215). In this case Protestantism would have been checked by a surer remedy than Innocent III thought he had applied when he embodied Transubstantiation in the first decree of the Council.[1] But it would have been checked by a process of absorption, not of inhibition, and an Evangelical-Catholicism arrayed in the beauty of some of Rome's finer garments, without the dour cerements which were wrapped around the Evangelical tradition by the zealots of Geneva, might have supplied vital religion to a united European church. When the medieval Papacy refused to mount on the wings offered by the teaching of Berengar, its development became more and more a worldly policy of defence against not only innovation but progress. It concentrated more and more on the mere wrappings of the body of religion, neglecting the spiritual call of saint and thinker alike.

---

[1] *Cf.* Janus, *The Pope and the Council* (1873), p. 350 ff.; J. P. Whitney, *The Reformation* (1907), p. 29 f.

[2] *D.S.C.*, pp. 23, 116, 207, 281.

---

[1] *Cf. infra*, p. 404.

PART II

CHAPTER XII

BERENGAR AND THE STREAM OF TRADITION

We have seen that Berengar's teaching exerted an influence far into the twelfth century. If he did not create an organised following, and if the Berengarians of the next age have left behind no formal treatises on the Eucharist, yet their influence was sufficient to call forth widespread literary activity from the orthodox thinkers. In the first stage of the controversy the orthodox writers were occupied mainly with the conception of the real presence, and the work of Durand of Troarn occupies the chief place during this period. In the second stage of the dispute the theory of Transubstantiation was elaborated by Lanfranc and Guitmund, and then certain questions arising from the implications of both these great doctrines were discussed by the orthodox apologists of the later part of the eleventh and the first half of the twelfth centuries. Moreover, Berengar's own teaching left its mark on some leading writers whose orthodoxy has never been impugned. An equally important question arises at the other end of the history of this dispute. Did Berengar's protest issue from a new and solitary voice crying out for the first time in the eleventh century, and was he the originator of the dynamic symbolism which is associated with his name ? Our references to John the Scot and Ratramn will have indicated that Berengar did not stand alone, but some further discussion is necessary to show that he completed rather than started a long line of spiritual teachers who held views similar to his own.[1]

The Augustinian tradition had never ceased to operate in the Western Church. While the influence of Ambrose was present in the Gallic and Spanish liturgies,[1] and formed the main strand in the Roman liturgies (Leonine, Gelasian, and Gregorian), yet Augustinian symbolism produced a marked effect upon the structure of the Roman service books.[2] As the centuries advanced the influence of Augustine grew and, together with the teaching of Ambrose, became the source of the eucharistic teaching of the pre-scholastic era,[3] and it was the growing influence of Augustinian eucharistic doctrine which created the first eucharistic controversy in the time of the Carolings.[4]

---

[1] *Cf.* Rückert, pp. 25 f., 50 ; Schröckh, xxiii. 437 ff. ; Vernous, *Deux Traites*, p. 4 ff.

This double strand of teaching was emphasised by Batiffol in former editions of his work, *L'Eucharistie*,[5] which have now been expurgated by the Roman authorities. In the edition of 1905 Batiffol wrote: 'C'étaient deux courants, non point contraires, mais cependant distincts, et entre lesquels se partageaient les Occidentaux . . . Augustin maintenait le crédit de la " praesentia spiritalis " . . . Ambrose s'accordait mieux avec le réalisme traditionnel.'[6] He continues by affirming that this dual current was maintained down to the time of Charles the Bald without exciting disquietude in anyone.[7] The Carolingian renaissance found the doctrine in a state of indecision, and two parties sprang from the attempt at solution.[8] Of course this passage does not appear in later editions of the book, and in an article in the *Revue du Clergé française*[9] he contradicted his earlier considered opinion by saying that the teaching of Berengar had no root in tradition.

The Catholic writer Geiselmann traces the effect of Augustine's eucharistic theory on Gregory the Great,[10] Isidore of Seville,[11] and the Venerable Bede.[12] While affirming the doctrine of the real presence, Bede interprets the eucharistic content as a sacrament,[1] mystery,[2] and figure.[3] The eucharistic body is prepared or consecrated,[4] it does not come into existence by virtue of a change in the elements.[5] Bede was the first Western writer to combine the two strands, Ambrosian realism and Augustine's symbolism, into a single system.[6] Bede's influence upon his pupil Alcuin can be traced in the 'Commentary on S. John' written by the latter.[7] But in a letter to Paulinus, Alcuin speaks of 'a consecration into the substance of the body and blood of Christ.'[8] This statement certainly embodies the idea of the real presence, but Harnack contends that it does not imply the doctrine of a change of essence.[9] Geiselmann, who reads Alcuin's statement in the light of the *Libri Carolini*, a work now attributed to Alcuin,[10] perceives metabolism as well as realism in Alcuin's teaching.[11] But this is doubtful. On the other hand, Rückert inclined too far in the other direction when he attributed Charles the Great's statement to Alcuin's influence, and suggested that Alcuin held one view privately and taught another publicly.[12]

---

[1] Geiselmann, p. 23 f. Also Greek ideas, notably the function of the Holy Spirit at the consecration.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 28–35. Batiffol, *L'Eucharistie* (1905), p. 354, holds that both conceptions appear in the liturgies. There were, of course, original Roman elements.

[3] Geiselmann, pp. 35–55.

[4] On the influence of Augustine on the ninth century, *cf.* Nägle, pp. 53 f., 147.

[5] *Études d'Histoire et de Théologie Positive*, 2e *série* (1905). *Cf.* Loofs, *Leitfaden*, p. 147; *Abendmahl*, ii. (Hauck-Herzog, i. 63).

[6] P. 347. [7] P. 348. [8] P. 354.

[9] Vol. lv. (September 1908) 517.

[10] *Die Eucharistielehre der Vorscholastik*, p. 43 f.

[11] *Ibid.* p. 72. [12] *Ibid.* pp. 44–45.

Autpertus, or Ansbertus, Abbot of S. Vincent, who flourished about 780,[13] denied that the body and blood of Christ are present in the Eucharist 'in veritate': they are there as visible signs of an invisible thing.[14] This statement is vague, if not contradictory; a clearer interpretation in the symbolic sense is given by the Emperor Charles the Great in the Epistle to Alcuin. Christ broke the bread and gave the cup as symbols of His body and blood.[1] Ahito, Bishop of Basel and Abbot of Reichenau (d. 836), defines the content of the Eucharist as ‘ salvation ’ or ‘ grace.’ It is not ‘ body.’[2] Leidrad, Archbishop of Lyons (779–813), draws a distinction between the external sacrament and the internal virtue.[3] But if the Eucharist has the external body and blood of the Lord and the internal ‘ life,’ yet the body and blood are the bread and wine, which remain in the sacrament and can be eaten by the unfaithful,[4] a statement which constitutes an important antecedent for one of Berengar's main contentions. Jonas of Orleans (d. 843) says that the presence of Christ depends upon the condition of the receiver, and is mediated only to those who receive worthily.[5] A similar idea was held by Maxentius of Aquileia (811–833), who said that the eating of the body of the Lord consisted in abiding in Christ through grace.[6] Theodulf of Orleans says that the Eucharist effects a mystical union with Christ by means of a passing into the body of Christ,[7] but the comparison which he draws between the Eucharist and Baptism shows that his interpretation is symbolical, although the symbolism is not bare. The bread and wine while ‘ signifying ’ the body and blood of Christ yet receive the ‘ dignities ’ of the body and blood of Christ, through the power of the visible offering of the priest and the invisible consecration of the Holy Ghost,[8] an explanation which, again, foreshadows Berengar's teaching that consecration produces the *effect* of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist.

---

[1] Migne, 91, 151c; 92, 207b, 271d.

[2] *Ibid.* 91, 25b, 71a, 152a, 498a, 513d, 516b, 967a; 92, 594b, 597d, 718d; 94, 126a.

[3] *Ibid.* 92, 596c.

[4] *Ibid.* 94, 118a, 658b.

[5] *Ibid.* 92, 596b. *Cf.* Geiselmann, p. 52.

[6] Geiselmann, p. 54; Rückert, p. 27.

[7] Migne, 100, 832 ff.

[8] *Ibid.* 100, 203: 'in substantiam corporis Christi consecraveris.'

[9] *Hist. of Dogma*, v. 311, following Münter, *Dogmen-Gesch.*, ii. pt. i. (1834) 223 f.

[10] H. Bastgen, *Neues Archiv*, xxxvi. 629 ff., xxxvii. 13 ff., 435 ff. The *Libri Carolini* appear in Migne, 98, 999 ff. The *De Divinis Officiis* and *Confessio Fidei*, formerly attributed to Alcuin, were not written by him (Vernet, Vacant and Mangenot, i. 691). Endres, *Beiträge zur Gesch. der Phil. des M.-A.* (1915), p. 2 f., is doubtful. Geiselmann, *Studien*, p. 51 ff., has finally shown that the *Confessio Fidei* is pseudonymous (*cf. infra*, p. 339 f.). On the liturgical works of Alcuin *cf.* Cabrol, *Rev. d'hist. ecclés.*, xix. 507 ff.

[11] *Die Eucharistielehre der Vorscholastik*, p. 86.

[12] P. 31 f.

[13] Rückert, p. 32 ff. *Cf.* Mabillon, *Annales*, ii. 246 f.

[14] Rückert, p. 35: 'rei invisibilis signa visibilia.'

This dynamic symbolism, which stresses the *effectiveness* of the consecrated elements, drawn from Augustine's teaching, was developed by Candidus of Fulda (d. after 865) and Christian Druthmar. The eucharistic body and blood, writes Candidus, represent Christ's body and soul. The blood symbolises His soul,[9] and he conceives of the consecrated wine not as the blood of Christ, but as a symbol of life or Spirit, which purifies us when we drink, through an impartation of His Spirit.[1] He makes no reference to a sacramental content of the bread and wine. Druthmar describes the Eucharist as a love-token left behind by the absent Lord.[2] No better symbols than bread and wine could have been chosen. The body and blood only exist in a sacramental sense.[3] There is no physical eating of the flesh,[4] but a mystical feeding, and grace is mediated by the sacramental symbols.[5]

---

[1] Migne, 98, 913b : ‘ in figuram corporis et sanguinis.’

[2] *Ibid.* 105, 763b.

[3] *Ibid.* 99, 866c.

[4] *Ibid.* 867b.

[5] *Ibid.* 106, 134a.

[6] *Ibid.* 52d f.

[7] *Ibid.* 105, 239c.

[8] *Ibid.* 240a.

[9] *Ibid.* 106, 69c : ‘ quod sanguis ille animae Christi figuram tenet.’

The part played by the name of John the Scot in the Berengarian controversy necessitates a fuller treatment of the eucharistic teaching of that writer, especially as John the Scot was a prominent figure in the first eucharistic controversy, which broke out in Carolingian days. John Scotus Erigena (d. about 877), the most acute and encyclopaedic philosopher of the Carolingian era,[6] incorporated not only the Augustinian eucharistic symbolism, but also some of the fundamental ideas of Alexandrian Neo-Platonism, and from him came down, as from a peak in the line of tradition, the stream of inspiration which issued in the teaching of Berengar in the eleventh century.

John the Scot probably wrote no separate treatise on the Eucharist,[7] but his theory of the sacrament is revealed in passages scattered throughout his writings.[1] Sacraments do not contain a real content in themselves, they must have a symbolical significance pointing beyond themselves, which is mystically grasped by the mind.[2] Their object is to materialise that which exists for the mind.[3] Because the Eucharist signifies something apart from itself, it is not to be regarded as having an actual content. It is rather symbolical of Christ.[4]

---

[1] Migne, 106, 69b. [2] *Ibid.* 1476c. [3] *Ibid.* 1476d. [4] *Ibid.* 1517c.

[5] Darwell Stone omits Candidus and Druthmar from his *History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist.*

[6] Batiffol (1905), p. 354, belittles the influence of John the Scot upon this era.

[7] The book attributed to him by Berengar and Lanfranc, which was burned at Vercelli in 1050 (*D.S.C.*, pp. 36, 47; Migne, 150, 413c) and condemned at Paris in 1051 (Durand: Migne, 149, 1423a), was the book of Ratramn, *De Corpore Sanguine Domini* (Migne, 121, 125–170). The problem has been finally solved by Heurtevent (Appendix I), although A. Nägle, *Ratramnus und die hl. Eucharistie* (1903), pp. 84–130, had previously concluded in favour of Ratramn. Astier attempted to prove that another work, also called *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, and wrongly attributed to Gerbert of Reims, was the book of John the Scot (*Bulletin hist. et philolog. du Comité des travers historiques et scientifiques*, 1902, p. 154 f.). Heurtevent (pp. 257–267) shows that this theory is untenable, and also shows (p. 268 ff.) that in the eighteenth-century controversy on the question whether John the Scot or Ratramn wrote the book printed in Migne, 121, Boileau had the honours against P. de Marca by attributing the book to Ratramn, but was wrong in concluding that an independent work of John the Scot was burned at Vercelli. In 1828 Laufs

Yet the symbolism of John the Scot is not a vague emotional recollection of the distant Christ. It exerts a dynamic influence upon the faithful receiver. The 'mysticae hostiae' supply a mystical experience.[5] By being mentally apprehended the blood of the Eucharist restores the fallen nature of man and deifies him.[6] The spiritual Eucharist, of

---

put out the theory that the book burned at Vercelli was that of Ratramn, and maintained that John the Scot wrote nothing on the Eucharist (Heurtevent, p. 274), an opinion repeated by Schnitzer (p. 184 ff.), following Floss (Migne, 122, xx ff.) and Huber, p. 103. Heurtevent concludes by maintaining that in the eleventh century the general impression existed that John the Scot's book was burned at Vercelli, but that Ratramn was the real author of this work (p. 277 ff.). Terminology used by Berengar in *D.S.C.*, pp. 37 f., 43, 'figura, signum, pignus corporis et sanguinis Domini,' occurs in Ratramn (Migne, 121, 162c–164a) in a passage which immediately precedes that quoted by Ascelin, and also attributed by him to John the Scot. Heurtevent (p. 281 n. 2) disposes of Schnitzer's argument (p. 183 f.) that Berengar consciously appealed to John the Scot, and that collected passages from his writings were condemned at the Councils. Heurtevent (p. 283) suggests that at Chartres Berengar found an anonymous MS. of Ratramn which he attributed to John the Scot. But Heurtevent (p. 189 n. 2) is not justified in contending that Ratramn published his work in 875 on the ground that it was dedicated to Charles the Bald. The earliest MS. does not contain this dedication, nor would it have been suitable as a reply to Radbert, whose work came out in 844, if published so late (Geiselmann, p. 177 f.). Heurtevent does not appear to have used Nägle's complete account (p. 84 ff.) of this question.

On this controversy *cf.* also Noorden, *Hinkmar*, p. 102 n. 2; Gore, *Dissertations*, p. 247; Lane-Poole, p. 66; Alice Gardner, pp. 76–93; H. Bett, p. 9.

[1] On John the Scot's teaching *cf.* Geiselmann, pp. 135–141; Huber, pp. 98 ff., 389 ff.; Von Prantl, ii. (1885), 22 ff.; Alice Gardner, pp. 76–93.

[2] *Super Ierarch. Caelestem S. Dion.* (Migne, 112, 170d–171a): 'sensibilia sacramenta nil altius significare praeter seipsa . . . remanentes in figuris, in earum vero mysticum intellectum mentis aciem infigere negligentes.' *Cf.* 140b.

[3] *Comment. in evan. sec. Joan.* (Migne, 122, 347a f.).

[4] Migne, 122, 140c: 'non pro veritate amplexanda, quia significativa veritatis sunt neque propter se ipsa inventa.'

[5] *Comment. in evan. sec. Joan.* (Migne, 122, 308c).

[6] *De Christo crucifixo* (Migne, 122, 1222c): 'Sanguis mortales nos facit esse deos.' *Cf.* 1002b.

which the material elements are symbols, is formed or prepared in the Church. But there is no local or temporal presence of Christ in the Eucharist.[1] His flesh has returned to spirit, into God, and cannot be comprised within form or sex, or become part of the flux of time, or be contained in any place.[2] The process of salvation operated by Christ through the Eucharist is effected by His divinity.

Our participation in Jesus in Communion depends upon faith,[3] so that the apotheosis of the believer demands an accessory subjective condition. In the Neo-Platonic sense the enlightenment of men is achieved through the earthly lights, which are images of the spiritual light, and especially of the true light which lighteneth every man coming into the world.[4] A mystical union is thus effected with God, which is the result of the operation of grace.[5] The wisdom of God descends through grace, a Theophany is the agent of the enlightenment.[6]

Across the stream of this strongly-flowing spiritual symbolism, which constituted the eucharistic interpretation of most writers in the Gallic Church at the end of the eighth and beginning of the ninth century, a reactionary barrier was now flung by Paschasius Radbert. Granted that the Gallic liturgies were formed under the influence of Ambrosian realism, yet the trend of eucharistic thought during this era was directed by the spiritual dynamic symbolism of Augustine. The only reinforcement for realism, received by the Carolingian Church during the preceding hundred years, was derived from the gradual introduction of the Roman liturgies into Gaul—which were inspired rather by the realism of Augustine's later years than by the more full-blooded metabolism of Ambrose—and possibly from the teaching of Alcuin. It is therefore a misinterpretation of the course of events if Paschasius Radbert is regarded as the protagonist of a predominant contemporary realism against the novelties introduced by John the Scot and other writers. The innovator was Paschasius, and this partly explains the indignation created in the mind of Berengar against his teaching.[1] Radbert was regarded, with Ambrose, as the chief exponent of the doctrine of the real presence in the days of Lanfranc and Guitmund, but the state of eucharistic theory in the Carolingian era cannot be read in the light of the prevailing realism and developing metabolism of the Berengarian epoch. In Carolingian days eucharistic theory was, as even Batiffol admits, in a state of flux.[2]

---

[1] Bach, i. 310 f., attempts to prove that John the Scot embodied the doctrine of the real presence.

[2] Migne, 122, 894b–c : ' nullo loco continetur, nullo tempore movetur, nulla forma seu sexu circumscribitur.' *Cf.* 993b, 994a.

[3] *Ibid.* 122, 140c : ' typum esse participationis ipsius, qua et nunc participamus Jesum per fidem.'

[4] *Ibid.* 122, 139b : ' Materialia lumina, sive quae naturaliter in caelestibus spatiis ordinata sunt, sive quae in terris humano artificio efficiuntur, imagines sunt intelligibilium luminum, super omnia ipsius verae lucis, quae illuminat omnem hominem venientem in mundum.'

[5] *Ibid.* 122, 576b.

[6] *Ibid.* 122, 449b : " Ex ipsa igitur sapientiae Dei condescensione ad humanam naturam per gratiam et exaltatione ejusdem naturae ad ipsam sapientiam per delectionem fit Theophania.'

The doctrine of the Eucharist in the early Carolingian period was treated in the stride of writers who were mainly concerned with other theological questions, and generally in expositions of Baptism. Paschasius Radbert, the monk of Corbey on the Weser, and for a time Abbot of Old Corbey, the mother-house in Picardy,[3] was the first writer to devote a whole treatise to the question [4] in his *Liber de Corpore et Sanguine Domini*,[5] although the first separate treatment of the Eucharist had been undertaken by Faustus of Riez.[6] The book was written in 831, and was first dedicated to his pupil Placidius, and then sent to Charles the Bald in 844.[7]

One of his leading notions was the identification of the eucharistic body of Christ with the historical body, which was born of the Virgin, suffered on the cross, and rose from the dead,[1] an idea to which Ambrose had given expression.[2] The sacramental content is the true flesh and blood of Christ,[3] the bread is His body, the wine is His blood.[4] The fact of a change of substance is stated by Paschasius, but he does not discuss the process [5] by the aid of the metaphysical terms 'substance' and 'accidence.' The Holy Spirit operates the flesh and blood of Christ from the substance of bread and wine through the sanctification of His sacrament.[6] The body of Christ is made or consecrated from the substance of bread and wine.[7] The substance of bread and wine is changed or converted into the flesh and blood of Christ.[8] The process of the eucharistic change is defined as the creation of a new creature,[9] a conception which constituted one of Radbert's chief contributions to the development of eucharistic doctrine and which appeared again and again in the eleventh century, when the theory of Transubstantiation was being worked out.

---

[1] Batiffol (1905), p. 358, holds that Radbert's book is characterised by 'a materialism which shocked the conscience' even of his own day. Sometimes, as when he dealt with the problem of the digestion of the elements, his work is marked by the 'gross realism' of his contemporaries.

[2] *L'Eucharistie* (1905), p. 354.

[3] Héfélé, *Theol. Quartalschrift* (1863), p. 359.

[4] *Cf.* Geiselmann, pp. 144–170, 240–256; Schnitzer, pp. 133–144; Rückert, pp. 321–376; Dieckhoff, pp. 13–43, 101–106.

[5] Migne, 120, 1267–1350. *Cf.* his 'Epis. to Frudegard,' *ibid.* 1351–1356; *Expositum in Matt.*, *ibid.* 1356–1360. *Cf.* cols. 890–897; and a collection of patristic texts, *ibid.* 1360–1366.

[6] C. P. Caspari, *Briefe, Abhandlungen und Predigten* (1890), pp. 418 ff.; Harnack, v. 312 n. 2; Darwell Stone, i. 129 ff. This tractate has been traditionally assigned to Eusebius, Bishop of Emesa (*c.* 340–360). Cf. *D.S.C.*, p. 90. Migne, 30, 271–276, prints it among the letters of Jerome, No. xxxviii.

[7] Rückert, p. 325; Vernet (Vacant and Mangenot, v. 1213).

---

[1] Migne, 120, 1269b: 'non alia plane quam quae nata est de Maria et passa in cruce et resurrexit de sepulchro.' *Cf.* 1279b, 1305c, 1340c, 1351b. Héfélé (*Theolog. Quartalschrift* (1863), p. 361 f.) questions the use of this capharnaitic statement, but points out that 'plane' is not used elsewhere by Paschasius. Radbert's notion appears in germ in Ignatius, *Smyrn.*, p. 6, and in Ambrose, *De Myst.*, ix. 53. Steitz, xi. 243 f., maintains that the realist idea of an actually present body first appears in the teaching of Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem (634), and (xii. 278) that the identification was made by John of Damascus, yet (p. 281) rather in the sense of Transformation than Transubstantiation. Nägle, together with other Catholic writers, admits that Paschasius emphasised this identification too strongly. But *cf.* Nägle, p. 182.

[2] *De Myst.*, ix. 53 (Migne, 16, 407a).

[3] Migne, 120, 1271c: 'vera Christi caro et sanguis'; 1277b: 'in veritate corpus et sanguis'; 1274c: 'Christi caro et sanguis quotidie comedatur'; 1281d: 'veram Christi carnem spiritaliter percipere'; 1285a: 'vera caro sit Christi.' *Cf.* cap. x. 1, 1303–1307.

[4] Migne, 120, 1277b: 'panis ac vini substantia carnem Christi et sanguinem invisibili potentia . . . operatur.'

[5] Batiffol (1905), p. 373 f., agrees that Paschasius did not develop the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

[6] Migne, 120, 1277b: 'per sacramenti sui sanctificationem operatur.'

[7] *Ibid.* 120, 1278b: 'ex panis vinique substantia efficitur'; 1278a: 'ex substantia panis ac vini mystice idem Christi corpus et sanguis consecretur.'

[8] *Ibid.* 120, 1287c: 'substantia panis et vini in Christi carnem et sanguinem efficaciter interius commutatur'; 1330b: 'panis (Migne gives "caro") in carnem, et vinum convertatur in sanguinem'; 1340c: 'terrenam panis et vini substantiam . . . in ipsam eadem carnem et sanguinem . . . posse converti.'

[9] *Ibid.* 120, 1312b: 'Prius autem quàm Christi corpus consecratione fiat, oblatio sacerdotis est . . . sed in verbo et virtute Spiritus Sancti nova fit creatura in corpore Creatoris'; 1277c: 'consecratione Spiritus sancti potentialiter creari'; 1310c: 'non alia quam quae de Spiritu Sancto creata est'; 1311a: 'neque ab alio caro ejus creatur et sanguis, nisi a quo

Geiselmann describes in tabular form a comparison between the realism of Paschasius and the symbolical teaching of Rabanus Maurus and Ratramn.[1] The realism and metabolism in his teaching were sufficient to create more than alarm in the mind of Berengar, whose eucharistic theory was formed under the influence of John the Scot and the Carolingian-Augustinian symbolism, but it is doubtful whether the violent strictures uttered by Berengar against Paschasius were fully justified,[2] especially as Paschasius did not describe the disappearance of the substance of bread and wine in a metaphysical sense. Moreover, Paschasius did not break away entirely from the Augustinian terminology current in his day.[3] He defines in Isidorean terms—and Isidore was a disciple of Augustine[4]—the sacrament as a pledge of our salvation, and says that the external things are to be distinguished from what is operated invisibly within.[5] The sacramental elements are a symbol, a figure, or a sign which fulfils a necessary function in the reception of the sacramental reality.[6] He defines a similitude with a quotation from

---

creata est in utero Virginis, ut Verbum caro fieret.' Rückert, p. 334. Cf. *Das Abendmahl . . . in der alten Kirche*, pp. 393–409. Dieckhoff, p. 37 ff., says that Radbert's idea of a new creation dominated medieval thought and became the special Roman doctrine at the Reformation. *Cf.* Geiselmann, pp. 158 f., 169.

[1] P. 147 ff. *Cf.* Ernst, p. 82 ff.

[2] *Cf.* Harnack, vi. 48 n. 1, who is partial to Paschasius.

[3] Geiselmann, p. 146 ff. On the other hand, in his reply to Ratramn ('Epis. to Frudegard,' Migne, 1353c f.), Paschasius incorporates the realism of Augustine expressed in the 'Epis. to Boniface' (Geiselmann, p. 252 ff.).

[4] Geiselmann, p. 70 ff.

[5] Migne, 120, 1275a: 'Sacramentum igitur est quidquid in aliqua celebratione divina nobis quasi pignus salutis traditur, cum res gesta visibilis longe aliud invisibile intus operatur, quod sancte accipiendum sit.' Harnack, v. 313: 'Paschasius gives most vigorous expression to Augustinian doctrine not as something foreign to him, but as if he had thoroughly assimilated it.'

[6] Migne, 120, 1279b: 'in figuram et characterem carnis et sanguinis.' *Cf.* the whole section, iv. 2, where the phrase occurs eight times; 1315b: 'plena similitudo exterius et vera virtus Agni atque caro ejus immaculata interius voratur'; 1278a: 'unde quia mysticum est sacramentum, nec figuram illud negare possumus.'

Augustine,[1] in which the latter describes it as a 'name' of the thing of which it is a sacrament.[2] Yet while he states that the species of bread and wine remain,[3] his language elsewhere is too strong for this passage to be interpreted as an indication that he declined the fact of a change of substance. What he does decline is to define the process of the change.[4] If by identifying the eucharistic body with the historical body,[5] and by describing the eucharistic process as the creation of a new creature, Paschasius materially advanced the doctrine of the real presence, his thought wavered on the results of the eucharistic change. He is not certain whether the consecrated elements are now merely figures of their former selves,[6] thus inverting the significance of the symbolism. The form of the bread and wine, after consecration, constituted a difficulty for him which he did not satisfactorily solve. He was still under the influence of current Augustinian symbolism. In his letter to Frudegard, who had raised the question, on the authority of Augustine (*De Doc. Christiana III.*), whether the words 'Whosoever eateth not my flesh, etc.,' were figurative or not, Paschasius says that the Eucharist must be accepted as a mystery or figure, otherwise it is dispelled.[7] The terms 'body' and 'blood' are figurative, although not empty nor devoid of a real content.[8] Again, the two substances become one in the person of Christ in the Eucharist, on the analogy of the Incarnation.[9] The sacramental process is not a miraculous change; it is not a miracle but a mystery.[1] Yet all this, when read side by side with the testimony of the series of symbolical writers already considered, only proves conclusively the strength of the Augustinian symbolical tradition in the Carolingian era, and suggests that when the controversy is regarded in its wider aspect, Paschasius, and not Berengar, was the innovator.

---

[1] 'Epis.' 98 (Goldbacher, *C.S.E.L.*, xxxiv. 531).

[2] Migne, 120, 1353d. ; *cf.* 1278a.

[3] *Ibid.* 1305c : 'maluit hoc mysterium in speciem panis ac vin permanere, quam in colorem et saporem carnis ac sanguinis demutari' ; 1306a : 'ille carnaliter sapit, qui adeo non credit carnalem (*sic*) Christi esse et sanguinem, quia speciem et colorem exterius non mutavit.'

[4] *Cf.* Geiselmann, p. 169 ; Dieckhoff, pp. 26, 35 ff. ; Rückert, p. 321 f. On pp. 352–358 Rückert overemphasises the idea of Transubstantiation in Radbert's teaching.

[5] Migne, 120, 1277d ; *cf.* 1277a.

[6] *Ibid.* 120, 1269b : 'in figura panis et vini maneat.'

[7] *Ibid.* 120, 1352b : 'si quis dicit hanc carnem et hunc sanguinem sic ipsa esse absque mysterio et sacramento, nec in figura ex parte sumendam, ut illi tunc carnales carnaliter sapientes senserunt, totam dissipat.' *Cf.* 1353b. *Cf.* Ernst, p. 38 f. ; Srawley, p. 556, for Greek influence on Paschasius.

[8] Migne, 120, 1353a : 'Haec quippe mystica sunt, in quibus veritas est et sanguis, non alterius quam Christi, in mysterio tamen et figura . . . et hujus mysterii verba tropica locutio appellantur.'

[9] *Ibid.* 120, 1278c : 'Unde Paulus . . . ait "Qui cum sit splendor gloriae, et figura substantiae ejus." . . . Quibus profecto verbis duas in

The reply of Ratramn, another member of the Community of Corbey, one of the Benedictine abbeys which had for fifty years been the centre of the Augustinian interpretation of the Eucharist,[2] represents the reaction of contemporary theology against the new interpretation of Ambrosian realism put out by Radbert.[3] Ratramn wrote his book, *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*,[4] under a commission from Charles the Bald.[5] The Emperor submitted to him two questions: In the Communion, is the body and blood of Christ received in a mystery which is perceived only by the eye of faith; or actually,[6] so that the body and blood are seen by the bodily eye? Is the eucharistic body that which was born of the Virgin Mary, suffered, died, was buried, rose again, ascended into heaven, and sits at the right hand of the Father? Plainly the Emperor had Radbert's treatise in mind.

Ratramn answers the first question by a sustained and consistent criticism of realist doctrine, and seeks to interpret Ambrose from his own point of view. Nothing is more absurd than to receive the bread as flesh, and to say that the wine is

---

Christo substantias declarat, et utrasque veras . . . consubstantialem praedicat. . . . Unde unam rem sumit ad demonstrationem duarum substantiarum, quam figuram substantiae vel characterem nominavit.'

[1] Migne, 120, 1316b: 'Quod si carnis species in his visibilis appareret, jam non fides esset aut mysterium, sed fieret miraculum.'

[2] Rückert, pp. 49f., 518f.

[3] This is admitted by Batiffol (1905), pp. 360, 362, 363.

[4] Migne, 121, 125–170; Geiselmann, pp. 176–218; Schnitzer, pp. 150–174; Rückert, pp. 524–553; Harnack, v. 318 ff. On pp. 178–181 Geiselmann gives a summary of the discussion on the orthodoxy of Ratramn. *Cf.* Schnitzer, pp. 171–174. Geiselmann, pp. 193, 210 n. 2, declines Nägle's attempt (pp. 347 ff.) to prove that Ratramn taught the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Nägle is supported by T. E. Bridgett and H. Thurston, *A Hist. of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain* (1908), p. 43.

[5] Cap. 1. Nägle, p. 113, following Mabillon, thinks that the formal dedication of the work to Charles the Bald is an interpolation, although the Emperor invited him to write the book.

[6] Cap. 5: 'in mysterio fiat an in veritate.'

blood.[1] On the contrary, Ratramn defines the Eucharist in the Augustinian-Alexandrian sense as a mystery, which reveals one thing to the senses and proclaims another to the mind.[2] The sacrament is only relatively the body and blood of Christ.[3] Hence, and this answers the second question of the Emperor, there is no identity between the eucharistic body and the historical body of Christ. So the identification theory of Paschasius Radbert was challenged immediately after it was published.

Continuing his positive statement, Ratramn draws a contrast between 'figura' and 'veritas.' A figure or symbol must connote by its form the process or reality which it indicates, thus bread and the feeding of the Eucharist indicate by their form spiritual feeding on the body of Christ. The term 'bread' does not indicate the substantial body.[4] 'Veritas' is a clear statement about a thing, as when we say Christ was born of the Virgin, suffered, was crucified, dead and buried.[5]

The symbol has substantial reality. The substance which the bread and wine had before consecration, they possess after it.[6] He then makes use of Augustine's distinction between the sacrament and the thing of which it is the sacrament (res sacramenti). But this 'thing,' or the sacramental content, or reality, is not the body of Christ in the realist sense of an actually present spiritual substance, covered by the accidence of the eucharistic species. Accidence plays no part in his philosophy.[7] The body and blood are only so called figuratively. The sacrament indeed symbolises the heavenly body of Christ, but its actuality, as in Berengar's teaching, is a *value*. The symbolism of the sacrament is dynamic. It produces in the recipient the effect of the body of Christ. It contains the virtue or power of the Word, an inward latent power,[1] the effectiveness of His body, for life is in the bread, and this is the body of Christ.[2]

---

[1] Cap. 11: 'nihil absurdius quam panem carnem accipere, et vinum sanguinem dicere.'

[2] Cap. 9: 'aliud exterius humanis sensibus ostendit, et aliud interius fidelium mentibus clamat.'

[3] Cap. 35: 'secundum quemdam modum sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est, sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est.'

[4] Cap. 7.

[5] Cap. 8.

[6] Cap. 54: 'Nam secundum creaturarum substantiam, quod fuerunt ante consecrationem, hoc et postea consistunt. Panis et vinum prius existere; in qua etiam specie jam consecrata permanere videntur.' In the terminology of Ratramn, species = material essence.

[7] Geiselmann, p. 212. Schnitzer (p. 162 n. 1) on the contrary sees a theory of accidence in his teaching.

Thus if the Ratramnian symbolism has a content, the body of Christ is not ' really ' present, for that is remote from human perception,[3] a heavenly divine thing.[4] It is life imparting immortality to the recipients,[5] in the form of grace or virtue.[6] The agent is the glorified Christ. This conception embodies not only the ancient Ignatian idea of medicine for the soul, it draws the Platonic distinction between appearance and idea, between body and soul,[7] possibly inspired by John the Scot, and certainly handed on to Berengar.

The concept of Metabolism or Transubstantiation finds no place in the doctrine of Ratramn, save in some of his terminology,[8] which was doubtless due to the influence of Ambrose. Transubstantiation is impossible in the light of his theory of substance, which, when used of an invisible thing, in contrast with the visible, he defines as an invisible virtue, or power of the divine Word, in comparison with the visible thing.[9] So the invisible eucharistic substance is a virtue, not a real presence. In a similar way he describes the eucharistic ' veritas ' and ' natura ' as the inward virtue of the sacrament, in contrast with ' essentia ' or the material elements,[10] although he does not go so far as to emphasise the Aristotelean distinction between substance and its mode of appearance. Substance, nature, essence, ' veritas ' in his system are simply ' things ' in an empirical sense.[11] That Ratramn prepared the ground for

---

[1] Cap. 56: ' non in specie, sed in virtute ' (*cf.* cap. 26); cap. 54: ' interius latentem virtutem '; cap. 22: ' potestas Verbi.'

[2] Cap. 52: ' Est ergo in illo pane vita . . . et qui est corpus Christi.'

[3] Cap. 9: ' corpus a corporalibus sensibus remotum.'

[4] Cap. 9: ' quia caeleste, quia divinum.'

[5] Cap. 19: ' Si mysterii vero perpendas virtutem, vita est participantibus se tribuens immortalitatem.'

[6] Cap. 72: ' Quidquid enim in ea vitae praebet substantiam spiritualis est potentiae et invisibilis efficientiae, diversaeque virtutis.'

[7] Geiselmann, p. 200.

[8] *Ibid.* p. 194.

[9] Cap. 49. Darwell Stone's translation of this passage (i. 230) is misleading.

[10] Cap. 78, 83, 54, 15.

[11] Geiselmann, p. 215. *Cf.* Nägle, p. 238.

Berengar has been allowed by most writers, both Catholic[1] and Protestant, and from the year 1559 until 1900 his book remained on the *Index*.[2]

Radbert's teaching was criticised, according to his own statement,[3] by several writers, and its innovating character is illustrated by the attitude of Rabanus Maurus (d. 856), the scholarly Bishop of Mainz. Rabanus was the author of many voluminous theological works, but, like John the Scot, does not appear to have written a special treatise on the Eucharist.[4] Although Rabanus has been judged to be strictly orthodox by most Catholic writers,[5] yet, like Ratramn, he declined to admit, with Paschasius, the identification of the eucharistic body with the body of Christ received from the Virgin.[6] The Eucharist, he says, is a sign, as Augustine taught.[7] The bread and wine remain after consecration, but they have a mystic value or effect.[8]

---

[1] Geiselmann, p. 217 : ' So hat Ratramnus Ansätze der augustinischen Eucharistielehre weitergebildet und Berengar den Boden bereitet,' *cf.* pp. 281, 283. *Cf.* Batiffol (1920), p. 440 n. 1. Yet Schnitzer (p. 167 f. ; *cf.* p. 158 n. 1) sees the doctrine of both the real presence and Transubstantiation in Ratramn's teaching, and, like Harnack (v. 321), thinks that the difference between Ratramn and Radbert was small. Rückert (p. 545 f.) thinks he was neither metabolist nor symbolist, but was really an Origenist, without borrowing from Origen, in that he conceived of the body of Christ in the Word of God. *Cf.* Geiselmann, p. 202.

[2] Nägle, p. 197 ff. ; Geiselmann, p. 218. For the history of the controversy over Ratramn's teaching, *cf.* Nägle, p. 194 ff.

[3] Migne, 120, 1357d. *Cf.* 1356d. *Cf.* Nägle, p. 80 f.

[4] The authorship of the so-called letter to Egilo (Migne, 112, 1510 ff.) is doubtful. Heriger of Lobbes speaks of a letter of Rabanus to Egilo in which Rabanus is described as a critic of Paschasius (Migne, 139, 179d). In Migne this tractate of Heriger, without justification, is assigned to Gerbert of Reims. *Cf.* Morin, *Rev. Bénédictine*, 1908, pp. 5, 18. The problem is complicated by the existence of two documents—

(1) A letter of Rabanus to Haribald of Auxerre (Migne, 110, 493a), which mentions a letter to Egilo.

(2) The tractate *Dicta cujusdam sapientis de corp. et sang. Dom. adv. Ratpertum*, attributed to Heriger of Lobbes (Migne, 112, 1510d ff.). Mabillon (*Acta*, iv. pt. ii. 592) identified the letter of Rabanus to Egilo with (2). Morin (p. 14 f.) agrees, and shows that Heriger of Lobbes did the same. But Morin (pp. 15, 18) does not agree that Rabanus was here writing against Paschasius, but rather against Hincmar of Reims (p. 16). Geiselmann (p. 222 ff.) declines this identification, although he thinks (p. 229) that (2) was written in the middle of the ninth century. He points out (p. 227) that Rabanus does not refer to one or two opponents, but many. *Cf.* Rückert, p. 553 ff.

[5] Summarised by Geiselmann, p. 105.

[6] Migne, 110, 463 (*Dicta . . . adv. Ratpertum*).

[7] *Ibid.* 269c ; 112, 88c f.

[8] *Ibid.* 110, 492d ; 108, 493b ; 107, 224a ; 112, 103c.

They unite the faithful with Christ,[1] and signify mystically the Passion.[2]

His theory of the sacramental process excludes the conception of a substantial presence of Christ in favour of an invisible ‘ thing ’ or eucharistic ‘ virtue ’ [3] in the Augustinian-Platonic sense.[4] Consecration produces the effect of the body of Christ, and in this sense the bread becomes His body.[5] The elements pass over into the sacraments of the body and blood of Christ.

Perhaps Rabanus’ teaching should be described as a dualism in which the symbolic conception plays the leading part, while his language is couched in the terms of Ambrosian realism. If he refers to the body of Christ extended on the cross, and the consecrated body extended on the altar, indicating that both are present at the Eucharist,[6] it would be an exaggeration to classify him with those who in later days set up the theory of Consubstantiation. He interprets the dynamic symbolism of Augustine as a process by which the mystic presence of Christ produces a real effect upon the communicant who receives worthily, not as a ‘ presence ’ in the realist sense, and still less as the result of a change of substance.[7]

Yet the teaching of Rabanus illustrates the enormous impression made by Paschasius,[8] even on those who criticised him ; indeed, some of the writers of that era were thrown into confusion, with the result that the eucharistic teaching of the next generation resolved itself into a dualism, in which no clear distinction between realism and symbolism was reached. Walafrid Strabo (d. 849), the disciple of Rabanus, described the sacrament as a representation in the bread and wine of the flesh and blood of Christ.[1] The substance of bread and wine remains.[2] Yet, without identifying the sacramental content with the historical flesh and blood of Christ, he speaks of the true body of Christ.[3] Amalry, the Deacon of Lyons (*c.* 850), is described by Rückert as a symbolist,[4] while Geiselmann finds metabolism in his writings.[5] The symbolism of Amalry was criticised by Agobard of Lyons [6] (d. 840) and by Florus,[7] but it was approved by Rabanus Maurus.[8] The Eucharist is a 'figura,' 'similitudo' 'imitatio' of the Passion, but in a sacramental manner.[9] The bread and wine and water are offered as a sacrament of Christ.[10] He interprets 'similitudo' in the sense of the Augustinian 'sign.' [11] The oblation and cup signify the Lord's body.[12] Yet Amalry's doctrine comprises the old-fashioned realism. Christ offers this body in the bread,[13] an idea which in the old Gallic liturgies expressed the conception of a Transubstantiation of the body into bread. But when referring to a conversion of the nature of the bread and wine, he describes a conversion of the 'simple' nature of the bread and wine into the 'rational' nature of the body and blood.[14]

---

[1] Migne, 107, 317a–c ; 112, 103a.

[2] *Ibid.* 107, 319c, 1106c ; 112, 822c, 1179a, 1187a ; 108, 502d.

[3] *Ibid.* 107, 317d : ‘ virtus sacramenti.’

[4] Geiselmann, p. 116.

[5] Migne, 112, 1186d : ‘ corpus tuum, quod de hoc pane fieri credimus . . . hunc panem ut corpus tuum fiat . . . ut nobis corpus tuum et sanguis tuus fiat.’

[6] *Ibid.* 107, 324d.

[7] Rückert, p. 524, concludes that the teaching of Rabanus Maurus is mainly symbolical, but that like Alcuin, while he held this view privately, in his writings he frequently used the language of realism.

[8] *Cf.* Migne, 120, 1356b. Paschasius says ‘ plures, ut audio, commovi ut sciant et intelligant digne.’

If the teaching of Paschasius Radbert was heavily criticised in his own day, it had strong supporters; notably in Florus of

---

[1] Migne, 114, 231c: 'figurans corpus suum in pane.' Geiselmann, p. 124 f., sees here the old Gallic idea of transubstantiation into bread ('die Figur des Brotes' stressing 'in pane'). *Cf.* Migne, 114, 338b: 'in panis et vini figura.'

[2] *Ibid.* 936c: 'in panis et vini substantia,' a statement which confirms Geiselmann's interpretation (*supra*, n. 1).

[3] *Ibid.* 114, 937d: 'vere corpus et sanguinem.'

[4] Pp. 37, 40.

[5] P. 87 ff.

[6] Migne, 104, 339 ff.

[7] *Ibid.* 117, 71 ff.

[8] *Ibid.* 107, 322 ff.; 105, 1143, 1154. *Cf.* Geiselmann, p. 107.

[9] Migne, 105, 989a: 'in sacramento Dominicae passionis.' *Cf.* 1334b, 1335a, 1138b, 1141a.

[10] *Ibid.* 989a: 'Idcirco presbyter immolans panem, et vinum et aquam in sacramento est Christi, panis vinum et aqua in sacramento carnis Christi et ejus sanguinis.' As Rückert, p. 37, says, the terminology is obscure, but the sense is clear. The priest represents Christ, and the bread and wine are only sacramentally body and blood. *Cf.* Migne, 105, 1141c.

[11] *Ibid.* 1138c.

[12] *Ibid.* 1144d: 'Oblata et calix Dominicum corpus signant.'

[13] *Ibid.* 1141a: 'in eo pane commendavit': 1334b: 'hic calix est figura corporis mei in quo est sanguis qui manabit de latere meo.'

[14] *Ibid.* 1141a: 'Naturam simplicem panis et vini mixti verti in naturam rationibilem scilicet corporis et sanguinis Christi.'

Lyons (d. 860), but whereas Rückert,[1] the Protestant writer, thinks that Transubstantiation exists in his exposition, Geiselmann,[2] the Catholic, denies this conclusion. Hincmar, Archbishop of Reims (843–882), was another exponent of Paschasian realism and Ambrosian metabolism, yet Augustinian symbolism also appears in his writings,[3] and both strands of teaching are repeated in the eucharistic doctrine of Haymo, Bishop of Halberstadt[4] (d. 853), and Remi, Bishop of Auxerre[5] (*c.* 908). The *De Corpore et Sanguine Christi* of the monk Adrevald[6] (d. *c.* 878) is a mere collection of passages from Cyprian, Jerome, Augustine, and Gregory, and is of little value for the history of the controversy,[7] but the absence of quotations from Ambrose suggests that Adrevald was not in agreement with the growing realism of his age.

During the tenth century controversial writings on the Eucharist were few. In the short treatise of Gezo of Tortona, *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*,[8] written *c.* 950, whole sections of Radbert's work are incorporated, but he foreshadowed the theological method of the twelfth-century writers. He related the doctrine of the Eucharist with fundamental dogmas of Christian theology. Beginning with an account of the Trinity,[9] he passes on to the Incarnation,[10] and so to the sacramental content.[11] Moreover, like the writers of the twelfth century, he perceives the basis of the union of the believer with Christ in the consumption of the body and blood.[1] Gezo reports that symbolism was being taught.[2] It appears in the anonymous *Responsio cujusdam de Corpore et Sanguine Domini*,[3] and Atto of Vercelli (d. 961) wrote under its influence.[4] On the other hand realism was taught by Rather of Verona [5] (d. 974), who presents a theory which resembles Consubstantiation rather than Transubstantiation, and, like Hugh of Langres and Durand of Troarn, he sees in the sacramental content the divine-human personality of Christ.[6] In the anonymous *Responsio cujusdam de Corpore et Sanguine Domini* Ambrosian metabolism together with symbolism appears.[7] At the end of the tenth century an attempt was made by Heriger of Lobbes [8] (d. 1007) to synthesise symbolism and realism, and this endeavour was continued far into the eleventh century. In Heriger, too, we begin to trace the influence of dialectics upon the eucharistic controversy.[9] A similar synthesis was attempted by Gerard of Cambrai, in opposition to the Manichean sectaries, who were condemned—some of them were burned—by the Councils of Orleans (1022) and Arras (1025).[10] Fulbert of Chartres (d. 1028) distinguished between the historical and sacramental bodies of Christ.[11] Consecration produces in the elements a higher value. The body and blood of Christ do not displace the elements of bread and wine ; [12] these remain present in order to assist in the salvation of the recipient.[13] If there is

---

[1] P. 493.

[2] Pp. 101 n. 5, 103 f. But Geiselmann, p. 104, holds that Florus stands in the line not of Ambrosian but of Augustinian realism, followed by Gregory and Bede. There are two strands of eucharistic teaching in Augustine (*supra*, p. 233 f.).

[3] Migne, 125, 296d. *Cf.* Geiselmann, p. 90 ff.; Rückert, p. 497.

[4] Migne, *passim*, 117, 118 (passages quoted in Geiselmann, p. 296 ff.) But it is doubtful whether the *Commentary on 1 Cor.* (Migne, 117, 567–575), in which Haymo's teaching is said to appear, was really written by him. *Cf.* Geiselmann, pp. 171, 256 n. 2. Heurtevent, p. 187, ascribes it to Remi of Auxerre; Rückert to Haymo (p. 498). The *De Corpore et Sang. Dom.*, formerly attributed to Haymo, belongs to the eleventh century (Geiselmann, *Studien*, pp. 9–36).

[5] Geiselmann, p. 173 ff.; Rückert, p. 501 ff.

[6] Migne, 124, 947 ff.

[7] Rückert, pp. 505, 553.

[8] Migne, 137, 369 ff.; Muratori, *Raccolta delle Opere Minori*, xxi. 167 ff.

[9] Cap. i., iii., ix.

[10] Cap. ii.

[11] Cap. viii.

[1] Cap. viii.

[2] Cap. xlv. : 'quidam hanc gratiam non credentes verum Domini corpus esse . . . sed figuram.'

[3] *Cf.* Geiselmann, p. 263 f.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 266.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 259 ff. ; Rückert, p. 558 ff. The 'Epis. to Patrick' (Migne, 136, 643d f.), formerly attributed to him, has now been proved to have been an eleventh-century document (Geiselmann, *Studien*, pp. 37–51).

[6] Geiselmann, p. 262 f.

[7] D'Achery, *Spicilegium*, i. 149 f.

[8] Migne, 139, 179 ff. ; *Sicut ante nos* ; Geiselmann, p. 267 ff. The treatise, formerly attributed to Gerbert of Reims (d. 1003), is now assigned to Heriger of Lobbes (Morin, *Rev. Bénéd.* (1908), p. 1 ff.). *Cf.* Geiselmann, p. 268 ; E. Dümmler, *Neues Archiv.* xxvi. (1901), 755 ff. Of Heriger's eucharistic writings we have the *Exaggeratio* (Dümmler and Morin), and the *Sicut ante nos.*

[9] Geiselmann, p. 277 f.

[10] Bouq., x. 536–542 ; P. Ragey, *Rev. du monde Cath.*, vol. 57 (1879, 3rd series, vol. ii.), 544 f. ; J. J. Ampère, iii. 351 ff.

[11] Geiselmann, p. 286 ff.

[12] Migne, 141, 202c : 'quae substantia panis et vini apparebat exterius.'

[13] *Ibid.* 202d : 'per salutaris eucharistiae infusionem influit Christus in viscera animae sumentis.' *Cf.* 204a, *infra*, p. 246 n. 2.

any truth in the allegation that Berengar began to question the realist theory while at Chartres, possibly the statement of Fulbert that the substance of bread and wine remained in the Eucharist had some influence on Berengar's thought. But Fulbert retains the doctrine of the inward presence of the body of Christ,[1] and of the change of the elements [2] into the substance of Christ's body, but without removing their material condition.

Throughout the two hundred years preceding the Berengarian controversy, the spiritual interpretation of the Eucharist, in the terms of dynamic symbolism, expressing a change of value in the elements after consecration, which produced an effect upon worthy recipients—an interpretation based upon Augustinian teaching—was maintained. It is true that the tide of this doctrine was on the ebb, and in the first half of the eleventh century had receded so far that, when Berengar's teaching became known, it was condemned as heretical. But the orthodox attitude had been largely created by the spread of realism under the influence of Paschasian doctrine, and this development cannot shake the conviction that, when Berengar appeared, he did not come as an innovator, but as the vindicator and latest prophet of a stream of tradition which had flowed steadily from the time of Charles the Great to that of Henry III.

A digression is permissible here, in an English work, to emphasise the influence of this stream of tradition upon English theological thought. A modern writer has stated that Paschasius wrote his work for the benefit of Saxon monks at Corbey.[3] So early as the time of Oda, Archbishop of Canterbury (942–959), the view was widely held among the Saxon clergy that consecration did not change the substance of bread and wine. The consecrated elements were only a representation (figura) of the body and blood of the Lord.[1] In order to uproot this idea, Oda, a Benedictine trained at Fleury, who shared with Dunstan the leadership of the Benedictine reform movement in England, on one occasion prayed that a miracle might be vouchsafed in contradiction of teaching which he regarded as erroneous. At the fraction of the bread, so the story goes, portions of flesh and blood were seen clinging to the Archbishop's fingers, and having convinced the clergy who were looking on that Christ's body was really present, Oda prayed and the flesh and blood were transformed back into bread and wine.[2]

---

[1] Migne, 141, 202a: 'non inanis mysterii symbolum, sed compaginante Spiritu Sancto corpus Christi verum'; 202c: 'corpus Christi et sanguis fit interius.' *Cf.* 195a.

[2] *Ibid.* 203c: 'in spiritualibus sacramentis terrena materies in Christi substantiam commutetur'; 204a: 'in excellentioris naturae dignitatem convertere et in sui corporis substantiam transfundere.'

[3] M. Jaquin, *Le de corpore et sanguine Domini de Pascase Radbert* (*Rev. des Sciences phil. et théol.*, viii. (1914) 81–103, quoted by *Rev. Bénédictine*, xxxi. (1914), *Bulletin*, p. 126).

Yet the more spiritual interpretation of the Eucharist continued to survive in England, and passed into a phase of revival under the widespread influence of Ælfric,[3] Abbot of Eynsham (d. *c.* 1020). While a monk at Cernel, now Cerne, in Dorsetshire, Ælfric wrote a volume of sermons,[4] and a volume of Addresses on the Lives of the Fathers.[5] His fame as a writer of sermons caused his Bishop, Wulsige, or Wulfsin, of Sherborne (993–1001), to invite him to write a pastoral letter, or collection of canons, for the use of the clergy of the diocese. This work Ælfric performed in 1001.[6] His fame spread far beyond the diocese of Sherborne, and Wulfstan, Bishop of

---

[1] Migne, 133, 939b; Mabillon, *Vet. Analecta*, p. 495 ff.

[2] Malmesbury, *G.P.*, p. 25, gives a shortened account of this legend.

[3] The problem of Ælfric's writings has been cleared up by Bernard Fehr, *Die Hirtenbriefe Ælfric's in altenglischer und lateinischer Fassung* (*Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa*, Bd. ix.), 1914, and by R. Brotanek, *Texte und Untersuchungen zur altengl. Literatur und Kirchengesch.* (1913). On the identity of Ælfric *cf.* articles in the *Dic. Nat. Biog.*, *Encyclop. Britan.*, and C. L. White, *Ælfric* (*Yale Studies in English*, ii. 1908, 35–70, 88–100). But Fehr points out (p. xxxv n. 1) that Miss White has taken much of her material from E. Dietrich, *Zur Literaturgeschichte der angelsächsischen Kirche* (*Zeitschrift für historische Theologie*, Bd. 25 (1855), 487–594; Bd. 26 (1856), 163–256). On the prevalence of the name Ælfric in Saxon times, *cf.* W. G. Searle, *Onomasticon Anglo-Saxonicum* (1897), and *Anglo-Saxon Bishops, Kings and Nobles* (1899). A less pretentious book is that of S. H. Gem, *An Anglo-Saxon Abbot* (1912). The identification in Chevalier, *Sources*, i. 152, is erroneous. Chevalier identifies Ælfric Grammaticus with the Archbishop of Canterbury, and Ælfric Bata with the Abbot of Eynsham. The Grammaticus and the Abbot of Eynsham were one and the same.

[4] Edited by B. Thorpe, *The Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church*.

[5] *Cf.* B. Fehr, *Die Hirtenbriefe*, pp. xxv. f.

[6] Fehr, pp. 1–34. Thorpe, *Ancient Laws*, pp. 441–451. For the date *cf.* Fehr, p. xxxviii. *Cf.* also Spelman and Wilkins in their editions of the Councils.

Worcester, who afterwards became Archbishop of York (d. 1023), and held the northern primacy in conjunction with Worcester until 1016, offered Ælfric the abbacy of Eynsham in Oxfordshire. While Abbot of Eynsham, Ælfric wrote two pastoral letters or collections of rules in Anglo-Saxon and three in Latin for Wulfstan, doubtless for the use of the clergy in the sees of York and Worcester. These letters appear to have been written 1003–7.[1]

In the north and south of England, then, Ælfric's teaching had wide currency. Hence the importance of his *Sermon on the Sacrifice on Easter Day*.[2] The eucharistic body of Christ, the 'housel,' is typical or figurative, not literal. It is a 'ghostly mystery.'[3] It is not Christ's body in a bodily, but in a spiritual, form.[4] This mystery is a pledge and symbol, whereas Christ's body is truth. The pledge we hold mystically until we come to the truth, and then this pledge will be ended.[5] Like Ratramn, he draws a clear distinction between the historical and eucharistic bodies of Christ. 'Great is the difference between the body in which Christ suffered and the body which is hallowed for housel.'[6] Consecration does not destroy the elements of bread and wine. 'The visible appearance of its own nature' is present in the consecrated host. 'By nature it is corruptible bread and corruptible wine.'[7] That his conception of the change, or effect of consecration, is not that of metabolism is proved by the statement in the letter to Wulsige, where he speaks of Christ changing the bread to His body, and the wine to His blood before the Passion,[8] when no actual change took place. He speaks rather of a 'hallowing' and of its effects.[9] The Ratramnian illustration from Baptism is used.[1] The result of consecration is to produce in the housel 'ghostly might' or life, which gives immortality to the believing receiver, to whom is granted the whole body in each part of the host.[2] 'Whatsoever there is in the housel which gives us the substance of life, that is its ghostly power and efficacy: therefore is the holy housel called a mystery, because one thing is seen therein, and another thing is understood.'[3]

---

[1] Fehr, p. liii. [2] Thorpe, *Homilies*, ii. 263–283. [3] *Ibid.* 269.

[4] *Ibid.* 271, and 'Letter to Wulsige,' Fehr, p. 30 f. Thorpe, *Ancient Laws*, p. 450 (Canon 36).

[5] Thorpe, *Homilies*, ii. 273.

[6] *Ibid.* 271: 'The body verily in which Christ suffered was born of Mary's flesh, with blood and with bones, with skin and with sinews, with human limbs, quickened by a rational soul; and his ghostly body, which we call housel, is gathered of many corns, without blood and bone, limbless and soulless, and there is, therefore, nothing therein to be understood bodily, but all is to be understood spiritually.' *Cf.* p. 269. This passage is taken from Ratramn (Migne, 121, cap. 72).

[7] Thorpe, *Homilies*, ii. 271.

[8] Fehr, p. 31; Thorpe, *Ancient Laws*, p. 450.

[9] Thorpe, *Homilies*, ii. 269.

Thus, although he adopts some of the phraseology of realism by stating that, after hallowing, the bread and wine are His body and blood, yet he uses the term in a symbolical and mystical sense. In Ælfric's definition 'body and blood' are 'mystery,' and 'this mystery is a pledge and a symbol.'[4] But of still more importance is it to observe that not only does Ælfric incorporate the teaching of Ratramn, but he deliberately quotes, almost verbatim, several sections of Ratramn's book, the *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*.[5] Thus the influence of Ratramn was widely exerted in England at the beginning of the eleventh century, and again it was a member of a Benedictine house, and a zealous supporter of the practical Benedictine reforms, who disseminated the Augustinian symbolism. Ælfric's works were being copied in England so late as 1080,[6] so that the popularisation of Radbert's teaching, which was being effected through Lanfranc's book, did not pass without challenge in this country. Yet there was no hope for the survival of the latter when the last of the Saxon bishops and abbots had been displaced by Norman clergy, with the death of Wulfstan of Worcester (January 18, 1095).

---

[1] Thorpe, *Homilies*, ii. 269 f. *Cf.* Ratramn, Migne, 121, cap. 17.

[2] Thorpe, *Homilies*, ii. 273.

[3] *Ibid.* 271.

[4] *Ibid.* 273.

[5] In 1686 W. Hopkins published the work of Ratramn under the title *Bertram or Ratramn concerning the Body and Blood of the Lord*. On pp. xl–l of the Introduction he places extracts from Ratramn and Ælfric in parallel columns. These have been checked and are correct. The passages used by Ælfric were cap. 7, 8, 9, 10, 17, 18, 19, 25, 27, 28, 39, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 79, 88, and 95 in Migne's edition (vol. 121).

[6] Fehr, p. xv.

CHAPTER XIII

SOURCES OF BERENGAR'S TEACHING

THE development of Berengar's theory of the Eucharist issued from the critical bent of a mind sharpened by habits of philosophical inquiry. Dialectics or logic supplied an instrument of inquiry which was eagerly seized by an intellect naturally prone to probe behind the demands of tradition and ecclesiastical authority.[1] For the use of dialectics he claimed uninterrupted freedom.[2] This did not constitute a new method in the investigation of eucharistic doctrine. It had been used by Ratramn in the ninth century,[3] and again by Heriger of Lobbes in the tenth.[4] But to Berengar it was more than an instrument of inquiry, it formed the fundamental principle of theological investigation.[5]

In such a mind the extravagant realism of Paschasius, which was interpreted to illiterate people through the medium of the gross stories reported by that teacher,[6] could not fail to arouse opposition. Nor was Berengar dealing with an academic question of mere historical interest. The orthodox theological disquisition of his day is instinct with Paschasian thought, and even the legends, which came probably from the East and were certainly popularised by Gregory the Great,[1] reappeared in the treatise of Durand of Troarn. Durand reports the tale of a woman who, in the time of Gregory, laughed when the Pope gave her the host and said to her the words 'The body of our Lord Jesus Christ,' because she saw only a small piece of bread. Gregory replaced the host on the altar and harangued the people. He then prayed, together with the clergy, and found on rising from his knees that the bread had become a piece of flesh.[2]

---

[1] Grabmann, i. 219, thinks that Berengar exaggerated the value of dialectics.

[2] *D.S.C.*, p. 100 : 'ratione agere in perceptione veritatis incomparabiliter superius esse . . . nullus negaverit' ; p. 164 f. : 'quaerere' is more useful than 'credere.' *Cf.* J. A. Endres, *Beiträge*, xvii. 43.

[3] *Cf.* Migne, 121, cap. 9, 11, 15, 49, 54, 78, 83. But *cf.* Geiselmann, p. 215 ; Batiffol (1905), p. 363 ; and Nägle, p. 259 f.

[4] Migne, 139, 185b. The passage here appears under Gerbert's name. *Cf. supra*, p. 245 n. 8, on Heriger's authorship.

[5] *D.S.C.*, p. 101 : 'maximi plane cordis est, per omnia ad dialecticam confugere, quia confugere ad eam ad rationem est confugere.' *Cf.* Geiselmann, p. 290 ff. ; Endres, *Studien zur Gesch. der Frühscholastik* (*Philos. Jahrbuch*, xxvi. (1913) 165 ff.).

[6] Migne, 120, 1283a, 1298c, 1300a, c, 1302c, 1317b, c, 1318b, 1319d.

In response to the prayer of a presbyter of blameless life, an angel on one occasion appeared and transformed the bread on the altar into a boy, whom the presbyter received with trembling hands, pressed him to his bosom, and kissed him on the mouth. Then, after returning him to the altar, the presbyter prayed again and the bread reappeared.[3] Durand also quotes a variant of this tale, which probably issued from Palladius, Bishop of Helenopolis, early in the fifth century,[4] who reported that an old man of good life but simple mind consulted two other priests, who failed to convince him that the elements were actually the body and blood of the Lord. 'Unless I see the thing, I will not believe,' he cried. They all agreed to observe a three days' fast, and at its conclusion went to the church where, in the midst of a celebration, they saw a boy lying on the altar. When the priest was about to take the bread in his hand, an angel descended from heaven and sacrificed the boy with a knife, allowing his blood to fall into a chalice. He then cut up the limbs of the boy into small pieces, one of which, covered with blood, was handed to the unbelieving priest, who then confessed that he was convinced. Immediately the flesh became bread.[5]

It was reported that one day when S. Basil was celebrating, a Jew obtained entrance to the church. Although not a believer, he obtained a portion of the host in the form of flesh, and saw blood in the chalice. On his return home he told his wife of the incident. She was at once converted and obtained baptism from S. Basil the next day.[1]

---

[1] *Cf.* the statement of Paschasius Radbert (Migne, 120, 1298c ff.). They appear in Cyprian's writings—*De Laps.*, pp. 25–26 (Migne, 4, 484c ff.).

[2] Migne, 149, 1418b.

[3] *Ibid.* 1418d.

[4] *Ibid.* 1419a. Durand attributes the story to Jerome, but *cf.* Migne, 156, lxv; Sir E. A. T. Wallis Bridge, *The Paradise or Garden of the Holy Fathers*, ii. (1907), 159 f.; Darwell Stone, i. 142 f.

[5] Migne, 149, 1419a.

Then comes the famous story of a Jewish boy who was at school with Christian boys, and one day went into church with them during the mysteries, and communicated with the other boys. When his father heard what had taken place, he became enraged and thrust his son into a burning furnace. His mother raised the townspeople, who rushed to the house and rescued the boy, and pushed the father into the flames, where he perished. When asked how it was that he remained unharmed, the boy said that the lady who carried a little boy in her bosom in the church, where he had received the bread, had covered him with her robe.[2]

Tales like these, which were reported also by Guitmund,[3] had been popularised among simple monks, clergy, and people in western Europe for two hundred years, and however a writer like Lanfranc may have attempted to refine away the crudities of realism, that interpretation of the Eucharist was clearly presented to the great body of church people through the medium of these tales. It was natural that sooner or later a revolt against the theoretical conceptions from which they issued should occur. Probably from early youth the mind of the young Berengar had been provoked by the legends. In this contingency we may perhaps see the foundation for the rumour of his critical attitude to Fulbert when a student at Chartres.[4] His gloomy view of the condition of the Church in his own day appears repeatedly in the *De Sacra Cœna*.[5] He saw in the condition of the times the fulfilment of Apocalyptic prophecy. ‘In the times in which it has pleased God that we should be born we see the overthrow of religion, the sun turned into darkness, the moon into blood, when all confess that they know God, but deny Him by their conduct, crying "Lord! Lord!" but flying from obeying His commands.'[6] The passage confirms the report that Berengar wrote a commentary on the Apocalypse, but still more does it reflect the reaction of his mind against the eucharistic teaching of the day.

---

[1] Migne, 149, 1419d.

[2] *Ibid.* 1420c.

[3] Hurter, xxxviii. 145 f.; *cf.* 56.

[4] *Supra*, p. 17 f.

[5] *Supra*, p. 168.

[6] *D.S.C.*, p. 58. Schnitzer, p. 311 n. 2, sees in Berengar a precursor of the medieval Apocalyptists led by Abbot Joachim. But Gozechin also saw apocalyptic evils in the times (Migne, 143, 895d ff.). Was he also a precursor of these curious sectaries?

Throughout the controversy Berengar's method was well known to his critics. Gozechin charged him with attempting to solve the supra-rational by the aid of the rational faculty,[1] and Lanfranc complained of his attempt to understand everything through the medium of reason.[2] Guitmund sarcastically referred to his petty reasoning.[3] But if by this method, and influenced by a mental reaction against popular forms of realist teaching, he quite early reached the conclusion that the current theory of the real presence was untenable,[4] he allowed several decades to pass before his views were committed to a formal treatise, and even then he was driven by the necessity of undertaking a polemical defence against his enemies.

A passage in the Epistle to Ansfroi, written about 1050, suggests that he did not begin a thorough investigation of the historical antecedents of eucharistic doctrine until after his general theory had been conceived. He admits that he had only recently made a careful study of S. John's teaching on the Eucharist, and that the inquiry had thrown a flood of light upon his mind.[5] It does not follow that up to this point he had paid no attention to New Testament teaching on the doctrine, but probably, like some other investigators, he was not hitherto convinced that the sixth chapter of S. John referred to the Eucharist.[6] Yet the statement in the letter to Ansfroi shows that he had made no close examination of Radbert's *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini* at that date, for in that work Paschasius so closely scrutinises the teaching of S. John that any careful reader of his book must have been compelled to examine the relation of S. John to the controversy.

The letter of Ascelin to Berengar shows that at the same period he had not read thoroughly the book of John the Scot [1] (or Ratramn), a fact which Berengar had admitted in his letter to Ascelin.[2] Moreover, he contended that up to the autumn of 1050 he had formed no definite conclusions on the doctrine of the Eucharist.[3] Again, as Paschasius and John the Scot were the only writers alluded to by him, apart from the leading Western Fathers, it cannot be proved that he ever conducted a thorough inquiry into the ninth- and tenth-century antecedents of the dispute. To this extent, therefore, the suggestion of Reuter, that Berengar's views were not the result of a critically methodical investigation,[4] may be accepted. But Reuter continues by remarking that when Berengar began the process of review, he advanced by orderly stages of research, first into the writings of the ninth century, then into the period of the Fathers, and so to the New Testament.[5] How does Reuter know this? The indications are rather to the contrary—namely, that Berengar, having by rational methods perceived the irrational nature of current eucharistic dogma, stumbled upon his proofs by a random examination of the evidence in the New Testament and the Fathers, though without ever taking into his survey the numerous company of ninth-century writers. At any rate, John the Scot [6] and Paschasius are the only theologians of that age quoted by him.

---

[1] Migne, 143, 901c. [2] *Ibid.* 150, 427b. [3] Hurter, xxxviii. 10.
[4] 'Epis. to Ascelin' (Migne, 150, 66b).
[5] Sudendorf, p. 209. *Cf. supra*, p. 76.
[6] On the N.T. eucharistic teaching *cf.* Rückert's exhaustive treatise, *Das Abendmahl, sein Wesen und seine Geschichte in der alten Kirche* (1858). Three-fifths of this admirable work is devoted to the N.T.

Our knowledge of Berengar's teaching is derived from four divisions of his writings, representing, roughly, four periods of his life—correspondence, especially with Ansfroi, Ascelin, and Adelmann; short extracts from his little treatise, quoted in the *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini* of Lanfranc; the *De Sacra Cœna*; the *Acta Concilii Romani* (1078–79).

His earliest critics, Adelmann, Hugh of Langres, the monk Anastasius [7] of Angers, Theoduin, and Wolfelm, charged him with a denial of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, and with the assertion that the body of Christ was present only symbolically.[1] According to these writers, he also taught that the bread and wine remained in their material forms,[2] their nature and essence were not changed.[3] This removed the real content of the Eucharist and substituted a bare symbolism.[4] The result was to deprive the sacrament of all religious value, to depress the eucharistic elements to the level of common food and drink, and to involve them in the ordinary physical processes of the body. On this theory they could be used for any profane purpose, and might even minister to gluttony and drunkenness.[5]

---

[1] Migne, 150, 67c. Reuter, i. 287, viii. 4: 'Ascel. ad Lanf.' should read 'Ascel. ad Ber.'

[2] Migne, 150, 66b (*supra*, p. 77 f.).

[3] *D.S.C.*, p. 44 (*supra*, p. 167).

[4] *Geschichte der relig. Aufklärung in Mittelalter*, i. 94.

[5] *Ibid.* 95 ff.

[6] For the influence of John the Scot on Berengar *cf.* Nägle, p. 103 ff.

[7] To be distinguished from the monk at Mount Sinai who died 561, and also wrote on the eucharistic question (Migne, *P.G.*, 89, 207d f.).

Adelmann said that he was aware of Berengar's teaching two years before the date of his own letter,[6] which was written not later than 1050. So that by 1048 Berengar's denial of realism and his inclination towards symbolism were known. Is this conclusion supported by his own writings during that early period ?

Writing to Ascelin in 1050,[7] Berengar says that it is contrary to all natural law, and to the opinion of the Gospels and apostles, to hold that the bread is altogether withdrawn from the sacrament of the Lord's body.[8] The very words of consecration prove that the material of bread remains in the sacrament.[1] This emphatic criticism of the dogma of a change of essence is elaborated in the lengthy epistle to Adelmann, written somewhat later, between the Councils of Tours (1054) and Rome (1059).[2] He says that the bread survives and its substance is not annihilated (per assumtionem)[3] and Paschasius and Lanfranc 'rave' when they allege that the bread and wine, after consecration, through a breaking-up or annihilation of their substance, pass materially (sensualiter) into a particle of the flesh and blood of Christ.[4] If this preliminary objection to the theory of a change of essence stands, the whole of their case falls.[5] There is no evidence whatever that the flesh of Christ is materially (sensualiter) present on the altar.[6]

---

[1] 'Epis. of Adelmann to Berengar' (Heurtevent, 288): 'ut illorum de te dictis utar, non esse verum corpus Christi neque verum sanguinem, sed figuram quamdam et similitudinem.' Theoduin (Migne, 146, 1439b): 'corpus Domini non tam corpus esse quam umbram et figuram corporis Domini.' Gozechin (Migne, 143, 900d): 'umbram esse non veritatem.'

[2] 'Epis. of Anastasius to Abbot Gerald' (Migne, 149, 433c): 'post consecrationem panem esse materaliter, et corpus Domini figuraliter tantum et non veraciter.' Wolfelm (Migne, 154, 413b): 'in eis panem et vinum.' Durand (Migne, 149, 1377b): 'panis et vini munera post consecrationem etiam quod fuerant permanere.'

[3] Hugh of Langres (Migne, 142, 1327a).

[4] Durand (Migne, 149, 1393a): 'divinoque mysterio veritatem, quantum in ipsis est, derogant; eo quod similitudo dicatur aliquando, vel figura, ac si aliquod sit figmentum non veritas.' *Ibid.* 1377a: 'nihil in sacramentis Dominicis ad veritatem fieri sed omnia potius per figuram et similitudinem geri.' *Cf.* also the charge brought against him at Vercelli, and the confession submitted to him by Humbert (1059) (Migne, 150, 410 f.) in which all these elements of his teaching are condemned.

[5] Gozechin (Migne, 143, 900d); Durand (Migne, 149, 1377b).

[6] Heurtevent, p. 289,: 'Haec ante hoc biennium cum audissem.'

[7] *Supra*, p. 77.

[8] Migne, 150, 66b: 'sacramento Dominici corporis decedere panis omnino substantiam.'

Herein lies the fundamental principle of the whole Berengarian criticism of the Catholic dogma of Transubstantiation. It is contrary to the evidence of the senses. The bread and wine are there. They can be seen and touched. Secondly, reason compels an admission that it is contrary to the law of nature that one thing can be changed into another without the breaking-up or annihilation of its original elements. When the wand of Moses was turned into a serpent, or the serpent back into a wand; when Lot's wife was turned into a pillar of salt, and the water into wine at the wedding at Cana; when water and food are transmuted into the flesh and blood of the whole animal creation—a breaking-up of the one substance takes place before the other can come into existence. The latter does not exist before the former has ceased to exist. Supposing it were possible for the bread on the altar to be transformed materially, through a breaking-up of itself, into the flesh of the Lord, then a change would have taken place into a substance which before that moment did not exist. But that is impossible, since the flesh of Christ has existed for ages in immortality in a state of perfection.[1]

---

[1] Migne, 150, 66b: 'Convincere ipsa verba in consecrationem panis institutam, non decedere sacramento panis materiam.'

[2] *Supra*, p. 122.

[3] Martène and Durand, iv. 111a: 'panis superesse, non absumtam esse substantiam.'

[4] *Ibid.* 111c: 'panem et vinum usque ad consecration constare in altari, urgente consecratione panem et vinum per corruptionem vel absumtionem sui in particulam carnis Christi sensualiter transire et sanguinis.'

[5] *Ibid.* 112a: 'parte subruta unde superiora satisfaciunt, totam etiam non constare.

[6] *Ibid.* 111e: 'nihil in altari de carne Christi sensualiter haberi omnino necessarium esse.'

It is hardly necessary to point out that the modern theory of the indestructibility of matter does not affect the argument of Berengar. The redistribution of elements, on that theory, is so complete as to be equivalent, for philosophic and rational definition, in that era of thought, to the annihilation of substance which Berengar criticised. He admits the possibility of such a change of the substance of bread, but it must be transmuted into a substance which had no previous existence,[2] and this, in the case of the body of Christ, is shown to be absurd.

The doctrine of a change of essence was not only contrary to reason and natural law, it was contrary to Scripture and the teaching of the Fathers. Paschasius taught that a little portion (portiuncula) of the flesh of Christ is broken with the hands and ground by the teeth of men. Against that folly (ineptum istud) must be urged the statement of the evangelist, who reports that what the Lord gave to His disciples was bread, saying 'Take bread,' *i.e.* this *thing*. S. Paul emphasises the same truth when he says 'The bread which we break is the body of Christ.'[3]

Thus not only the physical terminology of Radbert, but the scholastic realism, which was being developed in his own day and which conceived of a change of substance in a philosophic sense, was refused by Berengar. His detailed criticism of the philosophic theory of the change appeared in later years, but during this early period he had at least reached a denial of the real presence. But he does not deny that after consecration the bread and wine have the religious value of the body and blood of Christ for the believing and reverent recipient. This is the first point which occupies his attention in his reply to Adelmann.

---

[1] Martène and Durand, iv. 111d–e. Geiselmann's reference (p. 292) to the impossibility of this transmutation, based on Berengar's teaching that the resurrected body of Christ could not pass through closed doors (reported by Wolfelm, Migne, 154, 412c), depends on whether Berengar actually held this view (*supra*, p. 215 f.).

[2] Martène and Durand, iv. 111e: 'posse panem per corruptionem sui transire sensualiter, sed in eam, quae nunquam prius extiterit carnem.'

[3] *Ibid.* 111b.

'You say you have heard that I deny the true body and blood of Christ, and allege that the bread and wine, after consecration, are not the true body and blood of Christ.' He continues with the comment that if Adelmann thereby implied that his view of the historical body of Christ was Manichaean, meaning that Christ only appeared on earth as a phantom, then he denied the charge, and replied that the human body of Christ was true and actual. This body now sits on the right hand of the Father on high. If anything is to become the body of Christ, it must be conceded that Christ antecedently had a body. 'I grant, moreover, that the bread and wine of the altar become, after consecration, according to the Scriptures, the body and blood of Christ, and so I can concede that after consecration the *very* bread and wine become, for faith and understanding (fidei et intellectui), the true body and blood of Christ,[1] yet not materially but spiritually, not through absorption but addition.'[2] 'I call the body and blood of Christ the very things (res ipsas) of the sacraments of the Lord's Table, not the sacraments themselves,' and he admits that Scripture does not use the term symbol of the body and blood of the Lord or of the 'ipsae res sacramenti.'[3]

So a distinction is drawn between the 'thing' of the sacrament and the consecrated elements, which are 'signs, figures, similitude, pledge'—that is to say, symbols—and this is the teaching of the Fathers, which is as clear as the light of day.[4] The 'thing' of the sacrament, the internal grace, is not received in the hand or mouth or teeth, but in the mind. The similitude or figure lies in the elements, for as Augustine writes in the Epistle to Boniface, 'If the sacraments have not the similitude of the things of which they are sacraments, they are in no sense sacraments.'[5] His idea is that the consecrated bread and wine which feed physically have the value and hence the similitude of that which feeds spiritually—the value of the body and blood. In his commentary on the

---

[1] Martène and Durand, iv. 110a f.

[2] *Ibid.* 111c: 'non sensualiter, sed intellectualiter, non per absumtionem, sed per assumtionem.' He appears to use 'assumtio' in a juridical sense, not philosophically as in the Greek doctrine of assumption.

[3] *Ibid.* 110b.

[4] *Ibid.*: 'sacramenta ipsa, ita etiam signa, figuram, similitudinem, pignusque appellari.'

[5] Goldbacher, p. 531.

Third Psalm, Augustine said that the Lord delivered the figure of His body and blood to the disciples,[1] and the Ambrosian *De Sacramentis*[2] speaks of the reasonable oblation which is a figure of the body and blood of our Lord and refers to 'drinking the similitude of the precious blood.'[3]

It will be observed that this careful statement preserves the identity of the bread and wine after consecration. But consecration surrounds the elements, for those who have faith and understanding, with the religious value of the body and blood of Christ. Two processes are in operation: the objective hallowing of the elements, and the subjective contact with a spiritual value of reality. Neither is complete without the other. In this context Berengar does not mean by 'faith and understanding' merely the rational apprehension of the process of the sacrament, but the conscious devotion of faith, directed to apprehend that which is symbolised by the hallowed bread and wine. If he refuses the philosophic as well as the physical realism of contemporary orthodox thought, he yet maintains his belief in the ancient Augustinian doctrine of dynamic symbolism—a symbolism which stirs devotion and feeds the soul with spiritual life. But the eucharistic experience is operated through a subjective medium. *To faith and understanding* the consecrated elements become 'the thing of the sacrament,' the body and blood of Christ. Herein lies no theory of an objectively real presence.

The distinction between the sacrament or the consecrated elements, and the 'thing' of the sacrament, or the spiritual value to the soul of the faithful and spiritually-apprehending believer, is unmistakably Augustinian. Berengar quotes no fewer than seven passages,[4] which he claims are Augustine's.

---

[1] Migne, 36, 73: 'eum adhibuit ad convivium in quo corporis et sanguinis sui figuram discipulis commendavit et tradidit.' Cf. *Contra Adimant.*, xii. 3 (Zycha, 140): 'Non Dominus dubitavit dicere "Hoc corpus meum," cum signum daret corporis sui.'

[2] The *De Sacramentis*, attributed to Ambrose in the Middle Ages, has recently been assigned to him again (*cf. infra*, p. 274, n. 4).

[3] Migne, 16, 443a: 'similitudinem mortis sumpsisti, ita similitudinem pretiosi sanguinis bibis'; 443b: 'Fac . . . hanc oblationem . . . rationabilem . . . quod figura est corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri.' *Cf.* Martène and Durand, iv. 110c–d, for Berengar's use of all these quotations, and Durand of Troarn (Migne, 149, 1394b).

[4] Martène and Durand, iv. 112d.

Three are accurately quoted. Three are loosely quoted. One is taken from a pseudo-Augustinian work which, however, contains the sense of statements to be found in genuine works of Augustine.[1] The word 'sacrament' denotes a 'sacred sign.'[2] A sign is something more than the form presented to the senses. It causes something else, arising from itself, to enter into perception.[3] Thus a sacrament is a little visible sign of the invisible divine thing.[4] The visible sacrifice is the 'sacramentum' or sacred sign of the invisible sacrifice, and Berengar adds, 'as words are the signs of things.'[5]

No estimate of Augustine's theory of the sacrament can be regarded as complete which omits these passages, and when they come within the survey, realism fades away. As the Catholic writer Geiselmann says, if Augustine did not exert the same influence as Ambrose upon orthodox writers in the pre-scholastic era, that was because he was involved in the dynamic and spiritual tendencies of Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, Tertullian, and Cyprian.[1] But he carried the line of thought very much farther than any of these writers would have gone. He draws a clear distinction between a material sign and its spiritual significance. A sacrament is not that which it represents. It is bread and wine to the senses, but it has the significance of the body and blood of Christ for the soul. It exerts a dynamic influence upon the soul of the faithful recipient. Its effect is the same as if the spiritual body and blood of Christ were actually given. Within these limits the change wrought by consecration upon the elements is confined. In the Berengarian terminology of Augustinian dynamic symbolism, they are changed not by destruction of the original material elements, but by the addition of spiritual significance.[2] The sacrament is the body of Christ for the inner man only. It is not in itself an objective quantity. It has a spiritual significance.[3] Its effect depends not on the act of reception, but so far as a man is spiritually a member of Christ. The pious receive the sacrament visibly, but the thing of the sacrament invisibly. The impious receive only the sacrament [4] (*i.e.* the elements). So he overcomes a contradiction into which Augustine was driven during the controversy with the Donatist schismatics, when the theory of the ministry, put out by him, based upon apostolic succession, caused him to contend that good and bad alike received the grace of the sacrament, on the ground that consecration by a duly ordained priest could not lose its validity on account of the condition of the recipient. But elsewhere, as Berengar pointed out, Augustine stated that it was a reception for judgment, because these do not abide in Christ, nor does Christ abide in them, and such do not eat His flesh nor drink His blood.[1]

---

[1] Geiselmann, p. 293 ff., analyses the quotations which are taken from *De Civitate Dei*, x. 5 ; *Contra Faustum*, xix. 16 ; *De Doc. Christiana*, ii. 1 ; *De Catechiz. Rud.*, p. 26 ; pseudo-Aug., *De Paenitentia* (*cf. infra*, n. 4). *Cf.* Adam, *Eucharistielehre des hl. Augustin* (1908), p. 134 ff.

It is curious that Darwell Stone omits some of these passages in his pages on the teaching of Augustine. They supply the key to the Augustinian theory of the Eucharist, and they indicate that Augustine's realism is confined to his language. His thought was fundamentally symbolical (*cf.* Geiselmann, pp. 35 ff., 38 ff., 142 f., 186 f., 216 f., 252 ff., 290 ff., etc. ; Rückert, *Das Abendmahl in der alten Kirche*, pp. 353–372 ; Harnack, v. 157 ff.). But Darwell Stone, i. 65, quotes Augustine's references to the eucharistic content as a 'sign' (*Con. Adimant.*, xii. 3) and 'figure' (*Ps. iii. En. 1* ; *De Doc. Christ.*, iii. 23). Even Adam, pp. 41 f., 54, 60, admits a symbolical tendency in Augustine, and traces it to Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus (but *cf.* p. 141) ; Batiffol (1920), p. 422 ff., also perceives the symbolist strand, but thinks it was inspired by Cyprian (p. 446). Adam, p. 57, finds no theory of Transubstantiation in Augustine, an admission which is less clearly made by Batiffol, p. 453.

[2] Aug., *De Civ. Dei*, x. 5 : 'sacramentum, id est sacrum signum est' (Hoffmann, xl. pt. i. 452).

[3] Aug., *De Doc. Christ.*, ii. 1 : 'Signum est enim res praeter speciem quam ingerit sensibus, aliud aliquid ex se faciens in cognitionem venire' (Migne, 34, 35).

[4] Aug., *De Cat. Rud.*, p. 26 (Migne, 40, 314) : 'signacula quidem rerum divinarum esse visibilia,' which Berengar quotes (M. and D., iv. 112e), 'sacramentum est divinae rei invisibilis signaculum visibile.' With this quotation agrees in idea another, 'divini mysterii signaculum' (*ibid.*), which Berengar assigns to Aug., *De Paenitentia*. But it does not appear in the pseudo-Aug. *De vera et falsa Paenitate*, nor in the *Sermones de Paenitentia*. Alger, *De Corp. et Sang. Dom.* (Hurter, xxiii. 91), also ascribes to Augustine, Berengar's quotation from a 'certain epistle,' 'sacramentum est invisibilis gratiae visibilis forma,' but while not found verbally in Augustine's works, it embodies the idea of his statement in *Quaest. in Hept. In Levit. LXXXIV* (Migne, 34, 712), and possibly in Epis. 166, viii. 22 (Goldbacher, *Corp. Script. Eccles. Lat.*, xliv. 577).

[5] Aug., *De Civ. Dei*, x. 5, with additional words inspired by *Con. Faustum*, xix. 16 : 'quaedam quasi verba visibilia.' Berengar's rendering (M. and D., iv. 115a) is 'sacrificii visibilia signa sunt invisibilium sicut verba sonantia signa sunt rerum.'

---

[1] Geiselmann, p. 40. Even Batiffol (1920) admits the influence of symbolism in S. Augustine (*cf.* pp. 422 ff., 426), but holds that his realism explains it away (pp. 428, 438 ff.).

[2] Martène and Durand, iv. 111c: 'non sensualiter, sed intellectualiter, non per absumtionem, sed per assumtionem.' Geiselmann, p. 292, quoting the context of this passage, says that Berengar conceived the possibility of such a change, but Berengar plainly refers to chemical changes to which bread is subject, and not to the eucharistic change. He is criticising Paschasius and Lanfranc (*supra*, p. 257).

[3] Geiselmann, p. 297: 'Das Sakrament ist darum Leib Christi nur für den inneren Menschen, nicht an sich in seiner objectiven Grösse, sondern in seiner geistigen Bedeutung.'

[4] Martène and Durand, iv. 110e.

Thus at this early stage Berengar denied a physical change in the elements of bread and wine, yet allowed that consecration produced a positive effect. It gave to the elements the spiritual value of the body and blood of Christ. But the spiritual actuality depends on the relation or attitude of the recipient to the sacrament, and mere reception does not effect communion. He draws the Augustinian distinction between a sacrament and the thing of the sacrament.

---

[1] Martène and Durand, iv. 112c, quoting Augustine, *In Joan.*, Tr. xxvi. 13 (Migne, 35, 1612 f.); Tr. xxvii. 5–6 (*ibid.* 1617 f.); and *Sermon lxxi.* 17 (Migne, 38, 460 f.).

CHAPTER XIV

BERENGAR'S EARLIEST CRITICS

CRITICAL friends and enemies of Berengar did not rest content with the bare statement and denial of his doctrines, but in long letters and formal treatises took up the discussion, and began the philosophic grounding of orthodox eucharistic teaching, which was one of the results of the Berengarian controversy. Ascelin says ' So long as I live, by the help of God, I will hold certainly and indubitably in the sacred places of my heart, against all who attempt to enter with violence, that the bread and wine on the altar, by the power of the Holy Ghost, through the ministry of the priest, are made true body and true blood of Christ.'[1] This can be proved by Scripture, if a wrong interpretation is not put upon its statements. John the Scot maintained that what was consecrated on the altar was not the true body and blood of Christ.[2] This could be refuted from the writings of the Fathers, and especially from the Gregorian Sacramentary. ' May thy sacraments perfect in us, O Lord ! what they contain, that what we take in form, we may receive in truth.'[3] ' Contrary to what is Catholic,' John the Scot denied this, and said that those things (namely the body and blood) ' are received in form not in truth.'[4]

It is to be noticed that the use of ' specie ' in the two quotations differs. For Ascelin and the Gregorian Sacramentary ' specie ' means the form of the material elements. For John the Scot (or Ratramn) it means the form or appearance of the body and blood, which is all that the sacrament contains. Symbolism is emphasised in the latter case and realism in the other.

---

[1] Migne, 150, 67b.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Ibid.* 67c : ' specie gerimus, rerum veritate capiamus.' H. A. Wilson, *Greg. Sac.* (1915), p. 105 ; *Gelas. Sac.* (1894), p. 202.

[4] Migne, 150, 67c : ' specie, inquit, geruntur ista, non veritate.'

Ascelin continues: 'For the rest, with Paschasius and other Catholics, I not only discern, but I venerate and hold that the true body and true blood of Christ are received by the faithful at the altar beneath the forms of bread and wine.'[1] 'I do not do this, as you say, contrary to the law of nature,[2] for by nature I mean no other than the will of God.'[3] Nature is not the cause of things, the will of God is the cause of nature itself and of everything born in nature. The will of God is so effective and powerful that anything can come into existence by His mere act of volition.[4] 'All that God wills He does.' He wills that the bread and wine on the altar prepared by the consecration of the Holy Spirit, through the ministry of the priest, may be mightily created as His true flesh and blood, and by being created daily, may be mystically offered.[5] This He Himself clearly shows in the words of institution, saying 'Take, eat; This is my body.'

Up to this point Ascelin's language and meaning are expressed in the Radbertian sense. But he wanders into obscurity in attempting to define the significance of 'body' in the words of institution. 'Lest they perceive lightly or think of "body" without discrimination,' the faithful are called members of Christ. He clearly defines 'body' and says 'which is offered for you.' So with the cup 'which is poured out for you.'[6] Ascelin stumbles between the idea of the body of Christ as the members of the Church on the one hand, and as the historical body of the Incarnation on the other.[7] His confused language suggests that the body of Christ is received by itself, that is by its own members, or the company of the faithful—that reception depends upon faith.

---

[1] Migne, 150, 67c–d: 'verum corpus verumque sanguinem Christi a fidelibus in altari sumi sub specie panis et vini.'

[2] *Ibid.* 67d: 'naturae rationes.'

[3] *Ibid.* 67d: 'neque enim aliud naturam dixerim quam Dei voluntatem.'

[4] This passage is taken almost verbatim from Paschasius (Migne, 120, 1267c–d).

[5] Migne, 150, 67d. *Cf.* Paschasius (Migne 120, 1277c–d).

[6] *Ibid.* 150, 67d–68a: 'ac ne leviter acciperent, vel qualecumque corpus putarent, membra enim Christi dicuntur quippe fideles, ac per hoc corpus, adjecit claritudinem, et ait quod pro vobis tradetur. Similiter et de calice, qui pro vobis effundetur.'

[7] This distinction was drawn by later writers, but as an additional interpretation of the term 'body.' Ascelin appears to offer it as the fundamental idea of the eucharistic content.

But a subjective interpretation is ruled out by the latter part of the statement. Perhaps Geiselmann rightly sees in this passage an attempt to exclude a figurative or symbolical interpretation.[1] This indeed is indicated in the next paragraph. 'The Redeemer explains what He means by "body and blood." The disciples gazed upon bread and wine with human eyes and they heard Him say "This is my body, which is given for you; this is my blood, which is shed for many."'[2] Ascelin's meaning apparently is that although what they saw appeared to be bread and wine, Jesus instructed them that it was body and blood. But he concludes the dogmatic statement of his epistle with a passage which shows how incompletely the Radbertian doctrine of a change of essence, in the metabolic sense, was understood even by orthodox writers at this early period of the Berengarian controversy: 'We ought not to marvel that God can bring it about, that that which is consecrated on the altar by the power of the Holy Spirit and the ministry of the priest, is united with that body which our Redeemer received from the Virgin Mary;[3] indeed both substances (*i.e.* bread and body) are material, both are visible,[4] if we remember that we ourselves are composed of material and immaterial, mortal and immortal substances, if we believe that the divine and human nature came together in one person.' In this statement, firstly, Ascelin avoids the Radbertian doctrine of a change of essence.[5] His thought is rather that of Heriger of Lobbes, who had already given expression to the idea of a unifying process of the bread with the body, rather than a change of essence.[6] It is also possible to see here the beginning of the later doctrine of impanation, or coming of Christ into the bread on the analogy of the Incarnation.[7] Secondly, a curious confusion of thought is apparent. He speaks of both substances, meaning the bread and body, being material and visible. This really goes farther than the Radbertian doctrine in the direction of a physical presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and it is indeed not what Ascelin means. His allusion to the body and soul in man, and the humanity and Godhead in Christ, shows that he conceived of a union of spiritual and material essence, so that the reference to the material nature of the two substances is superfluous and indeed contradictory. It seems clear that Ascelin accepted the general principle of the Radbertian change of essence, but when he attempted to work it out he fell into confusion. Schnitzer [1] maintains that Ascelin had no clear grasp of eucharistic teaching, and Geiselmann thinks that his phraseology indicates that at this early period of the controversy the Catholic writers had as little grasp of the dialectical criticism of the theory of the change as Paschasius Radbert when he met the criticism of Ratramn.[2]

---

[1] P. 301.
[2] Migne, 150, 168a.
[3] *Ibid.* 68b.
[4] *Ibid.* 68b: 'quippe utrumque substantia corporea, utrumque visibile.'
[5] *Cf.* Geiselmann on Radbert, p. 168 f.
[6] *Ibid.* p. 237.
[7] *Ibid.* p. 302.

But this want was supplied by Adelmann in a letter to Berengar, which has the dimensions of a treatise. Adelmann begins his positive statement by a quotation from S. John vi.: 'I am the living bread which came down from heaven. Whosoever eateth of this bread shall live for ever: the bread which I shall give is my flesh, for the life of the world.' Adelmann notes that Christ says 'I will give,' not 'I have given,' that His words refer to the Eucharist which was yet to be instituted, and not to the feeding of the five thousand, which was past. Christ began to give His flesh on the day before He suffered, as the words of institution indicate. If the words of institution are not credited, then either the veracity of Christ is questioned or the words cannot be genuine. But cannot He whose word at the beginning created the light from nothing, also say of the bread 'This is my body,' so that it becomes so? And could not He whose authority turned water into wine, by the use of the same authority vocally mediated, turn wine into His blood? [3] Here is the Radbertian doctrine expressed in its naked metabolism.

The change takes place by the agency of the human ministry through which Christ Himself operates.[4] He had said 'Without me ye can do nothing' and 'Behold! I am with you always, even to the end of the world.' This presence is possible by reason of His divinity or uncircumscribed nature in His twofold Person, which enables Him to be wholly everywhere, yet without special location.[1] As Son of God He was in Heaven, even before ascending as Son of Man. So also, by virtue of the unity of His Person He remained on earth with man after He had ascended into heaven, a dialectical argument which has no justification save in its logic. Yet Adelmann applies it not only to explain the eucharistic change, but as the basis of sacramental theory generally. Because Christ remains always with men, He baptises men through men, and consecrates whatever is consecrated through men.[2] Through the hand and mouth of the priest Christ both baptises and creates His body and blood.[3] That which He once did passibly in Himself, He does daily and impassibly through those to whom He gives power to become the sons of God.

---

[1] P. 325 n. 3.

[2] P. 303.

[3] Heurtevent, p. 291: 'vinum ipsum in sanguinem suum transferre?'

[4] *Ibid.* p. 291: 'per ministerium humanum, Christum ipsum operari fateamur.'

Adelmann is groping for the conception of the Eucharist as a sacrifice, but he swings back in the direction of a symbolical interpretation. The words 'This do in remembrance of me' are the most sure pledge of His love to the disciples and of obedience to God.[4] The sacrament is not visibly transmuted into the form of flesh and blood [5] because we walk by faith and not by sight. If the sacraments showed outwardly the things that are within, the faith by which the just liveth would be not only idle, but altogether non-existent. This was a loftier conception than that of Paschasius, who, like Ambrose, explained away the appearance of bread and wine as a concession to human weakness, which could not tolerate the sight of flesh and blood. Faith is exercised in believing what is not apparent. The life-giving sacrament lies hidden in power beneath the material species, as the soul in the body.[6]

Adelmann was the first of Berengar's opponents to make use of psychology, a weapon which Ratramn had directed against the Radbertian system. He classifies the modes of perception as physical, such as hearing and seeing; physico-mental, such as reading and writing; and intellectual, such as the apprehension of the relation between numbers and sounds, or the ideas of incorporeal things which can only be understood to a limited degree.[1] In addition to these three modes of perception he refers to another, which, however, he terms 'a third,' in contrast with the material and intellectual processes of perception. We can approach God directly, not by a natural process, but by the grace of God, and this is faith. Now the Christian sacraments cannot be discussed by human reason. They must be discussed by faith, that is by a divine gift (munere).[2] Thus, in Baptism when perception and reason apprehend nothing more than water, faith descending within, sees the life-giving power there, and simply gazes.[3] Thus he combines mysticism with his psychology. But the human soul always gushes forth, especially in those who through philosophy and empty fallacy, seek to discuss meticulously the causes and reasons of everything.[4] So although, like Lanfranc, Adelmann ostensibly despises dialectical methods, he not only, like the Archbishop, adopts the method, but arrives at a much more reasonable and lofty conclusion. Without direct reference to the Eucharist, he admits that the material of water survives in the baptismal sacrament. The incorporeal soul is born again through corporeal water,[5] and the process by which the spiritual gift or grace of God is apprehended is the process of faith, which itself is a gift of God. The spiritual gift is received rather subjectively than objectively. Was Adelmann at times unconsciously under the influence of Berengar's teaching, or did the Radbertian materialism only gradually stifle the more spiritual intuitions of the thinkers of the eleventh century?

---

[1] Heurtevent, p. 292: 'qua illocaliter ubique est totus.'

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Ibid.* p. 293: 'corpus et sanguinem suum creat'—a Radbertian conception.

[4] *Ibid.*: 'certissimum pignus sui'—a Ratramnian phrase (*cf.* Migne, 121, *c.* 87–89).

[5] Heurtevent, p. 294: 'non visibiliter transmutatur in speciem carnis et sanguinis.'

[6] *Ibid.*

But he falls back finally into the metabolism of the ninth-century writer. Faith, after all, is rather a mantle which covers up the metabolic process in the Eucharist from the scrutiny of human gaze, than a torch leading on to spiritual perception.

---

[1] Heurtevent, p. 295.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 296.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 296 f.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 297.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 295: 'animam incorpoream per aquam corpoream renasci.'

Is it a great thing for the Creator to convert the bread invisibly into His body, the bread which daily He causes to pass invisibly into our bodies? No one can grasp, by the material senses, the means by which He does this. The just lives by faith.[1] He reverts, in a quotation from Augustine, to the ancient Greek conception of Ignatius. The eucharistic content is a *φάρμακον* to heal the wounds of the soul, and to supply the principle of eternal life.[2] Another early Greek idea is to be found in his conception of the eucharistic body as a mystery, lying hidden beneath the material species, as the soul in the body.[3] Although as a loyal child of the age, Adelmann uses the Radbertian terminology—'transferri,' 'transmutatur,' 'convertere'[4]—yet his own thought betrays the beginning of dialectic inquiry, in orthodox circles, into eucharistic dogma, showing that the influence of the Ratramnian School was not confined to Berengar. If Adelmann was by choice a follower of Paschasius Radbert,[5] none the less some of his statements approach more closely to Berengarian ideas than those of any other critic of the Berengarian system—so incomplete is the hold of tradition on minds willing to think for themselves, and willing to make use of current methods of independent thought.

The main defence of orthodox writers in the early stage of the Berengarian controversy was a simple appeal to the verbal meaning of Scripture, and to the statements of the Western Fathers. In his letter to Henry I of France, Theoduin confines himself to the latter. He makes no attempt to develop a theory of the Eucharist. Quoting Cyril of Alexandria,[6] he says that the flesh which we receive in Communion is the very life-giving flesh of the Word Himself.[1] Then, if it is His very flesh, how can it be a shade or a figure?[2] As Ambrose says, this flesh only appears under the similitude of bread and wine in order to avoid the horror of blood,[3] and quoting the Ambrosian *De Sacramentis*, he contends that we have no more right to attempt to explain by natural law the presence of the flesh of the Word in the Eucharist than the Virgin-Birth.[4] Before consecration the form (species) is one thing. After consecration a body is produced (efficitur). Wine and water are placed in the cup, but become blood by the consecration of the heavenly Word.

---

[1] Heurtevent, p. 297.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 298: 'Sacramenta ista, velut antidota quaedam et cataplasmata, praeparavit; sine quibus vitam et salutem aeternam impossibile est nobis conferri.'

[3] *Ibid.* p. 294: 'vitale sacramentum est sub specie corporea viriliter latet ut anima in corpore.' Geiselmann, p. 305, sees in this statement the 'mystischen Metabolismus' of Faustus of Riez.

[4] But Paschasius uses 'commutare' for 'convertere.' *Cf.* Rückert, p. 352.

[5] The transitional character of Adelmann's expressions is revealed by the conflicting estimates of his teaching made by modern writers. Geiselmann, p. 305, thinks he was a true follower of Radbert. Schröckh, xxiii. 514, was not certain that he believed in a change of essence ('Brodtverwandlung').

[6] *Cf.* Cyril in E. Schwartz, *Acta Concil. Œcum.*, tom. i. v. (1925) 240.

Passing to Augustine, he says that the flesh we eat is the very flesh in which Christ walked on earth.[5] This was the flesh which Christ held in His hands when He gave the bread and wine to the disciples,[6] and these quotations prove that this flesh cannot be a shade or figure.[7] As Basil teaches, He who sits at the right hand of the Father is borne, at the time of the sacrifice, in the hands of men and delivered to be broken up by those who desire Him,[8] and according to Eusebius (Faustus of Riez), this one perfect victim is to be understood as an object of faith, by the internal disposition of the mind, not as a form (species) apparent to the eye.[9] Hilary says that no opportunity for doubt remains concerning the actuality of the flesh and blood.[10]

Theoduin's letter is of interest for the quotations from

---

[1] Migne, 146, 1441a.

[2] *Ibid.* 1441a: 'si propria, quomodo umbra? si propria, quomodo figura?'

[3] *Ibid.* 1441a.

[4] *De Sacramentis*, lib. iv. cap. 4 (Migne, 16, 439 ff.). *Cf.* lib. vi. cap. 1 (Migne, 16, 454 ff.). Geiselmann, p. 7, assigns this work to the first half of the fifth century. Batiffol (1920), p. 346, says about 400, criticising Aubertin and Daillé, who placed it in the seventh or eighth century. C. Atchley, *Journal of Theological Studies*, April 1929, p. 281 ff., assigns it to the sixth century. But this date had already been adopted by Watterich, *Der Konsecrations-moment im hl. Abendmahl* (1896), p. 170 f. Morin, *Rev. bén.* (1894), xi. 344, and Probst, *Lit. d. viert. Jahrh.* (1893), p. 239, hold that it was compiled from notes taken of Ambrose's sermons. A recent writer makes out a strong case for Ambrose's authorship (Otto Faller, *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* (1929), pp. 41–65), so that the question remains *sub judice*.

[5] Migne, 146, 1441b (Aug., *En. in Ps. 98*).

[6] *Ibid.* 1441b (Aug., *En. in Ps.* 55).

[7] *Ibid.* 1441b: 'corpus suum . . . non umbram et figuram.'

[8] *Ibid.* 1441b–c.

[9] *Ibid.* 1441c.

[10] *Ibid.* 1442a.

Cyril and Basil, two authorities not often quoted in the eleventh century. The knowledge of Eastern Fathers was slight in the Middle Ages.

To this period probably belongs the letter of Anastasius, a monk of S. Sergius at Angers, to Gerald, Abbot of S. Aubin's,[1] although its statement of eucharistic doctrine is coloured by the ideas of an earlier period, before the orthodox writers broke away entirely from symbolical expressions. The letter does not mention Berengar by name, but the reference of Anastasius to the garrulous arguments of the followers of Aristotle and Chrysippus, and of Cicero's rhetoric,[2] indicates that he had the Berengarians in mind. Although coloured by symbolism, yet Anastasius gives the fullest expression to Radbertian ideas that we have so far met in this survey: 'I believe that the sacrosanct body of the Lord, which is daily consecrated on the altar, by the office of the priest—all doubt being execrated—is the true flesh which suffered on the cross, and His true blood which flowed from His side,' and he bases his statement on S. John vi. 52, and on the words of institution.[3] They who say that after consecration the bread exists materially (materialiter) and is only the body of the Lord figuratively (figuraliter) and not truly (veraciter), believe rather their corporal eyes than the attestations of Truth.[4]

He then reverts to the terminology of symbolism, in almost contradictory terms. 'That so great a consecration is called bread and flesh, sacrament or figure, not only do I not refuse, but considering it with a rational faith, I embrace and approve it as Catholic.' It is quite orthodox to call the consecrated element bread, because Christ himself called it so.[5] It is a sacrament because beneath the visible form of those things which are seen the flesh is secretly consecrated by divine power, so that what is believed by the power of faith may actually exist within,[6] a statement quoted almost literally from

---

[1] *Cf.* D'Achery in Migne, 150, 63b, and Schnitzer, p. 326. Pletteau, p. 52, says that Anastasius had been accused of Berengar's heresy, and retracted in this letter.

[2] Migne, 149, 436a.

[3] *Ibid.* 433b–c.

[4] *Ibid.* 433c–d.

[5] *Ibid.* 433d.

[6] *Ibid.* 433d–434a: 'Sacramentum vero, quia sub earum specie visibili quae videntur, secretius virtute divina caro consecratur, quatenus hoc sit interius in veritate, quod creditur fidei virtute.'

Paschasius.[1] It is a figure because it is understood to be other than it appears to be to the material sight and taste. Christ who now dieth no more is offered, in the mystery of so great an offering, as a memorial of His Passion.[2] He concludes his synthesis of realism and symbolism [3] with the formula: 'After the consecration of so great a mystery I believe that I so receive the true Eucharist of the Lord's body, that in no way do I deny it to exist in figure or sacrament.[4] For if without a sacrament or figure I believed the Lamb of God to be eaten with the teeth, I should be guilty of a great crime as Augustine says.' [5]

The list of Fathers mentioned by Anastasius, in most cases without quotation, is unusually full. Did the early Catholic exponents of the doctrine of the real presence seek more widely than their successors for traditional authority behind Paschasius? He attributes to Cyprian a statement of the pseudo-Augustinian *Sermo ad neophytos*. Possibly he doubted the authorship adopted by tradition, although elsewhere he assigns it to Augustine. To a quotation made from the Ambrosian *De Sacramentis* he adds the Paschasian definition that the eucharistic flesh was the same as that received from the Virgin. He refers Abbot Gerald, without quoting, to the writings of Hilary,[6] Gregory the Great, Cyril of Alexandria, Leo the Great, Bede, Paschasius Radbert, 'that Catholic man,' and again to Augustine.[7]

If a comparison is drawn between his teaching and that of Adelmann, it will be seen that he lays more stress upon the Radbertian doctrine of the identity of the eucharistic body with the historical body of Christ, and upon the objective reality of the former in the sacrament. If he endeavours more frankly than Adelmann to allow for symbolism, he lays less stress on faith. Anastasius and Adelmann represent two diverging strains in the first phase of the controversy of the Catholic interpretation of the Radbertian doctrine. Anastasius inclines to emphasise, while Adelmann tends to whittle down, the Radbertian doctrine. The Berengarian criticism restrained orthodox thinkers like Adelmann from the pursuit of their inclination. On the other hand, the Humbertian and Lanfrancan defence expanded the conceptions of thinkers like Anastasius into the elaborate metabolism of the second stage of the dispute.

---

[1] *Cf.* Migne, 120, 1275b–c.

[2] *Ibid.* 149, 434b.

[3] Geiselmann, p. 307.

[4] Migne, 149, 434b: 'Ergo post tanti mysterii consecrationem, sic veram Dominici corporis Eucharistiam me credo sumere, ut tamen nullo modo negem in figura vel sacramento esse.'

[5] *Ibid.* 434b.

[6] *Ibid.* 434d.

[7] *Ibid.* 149, 435a.

The early defenders of Paschasian doctrine made no attempt to explain, still less to develop, the dogma of a change of essence in the Eucharist. In his long epistle to Berengar this subject was treated by Hugh, Bishop of Langres.[1] He begins with a criticism of the dynamic symbolism of Berengar,[2] based upon information obtained from him at a personal interview.[3] If Berengar, whom he compliments as the most acute of men, had examined the nature of things, and had not scrutinised the opinions of the Fathers with a distraught and prejudiced mind, it would have been impossible for him to describe the sacrament as the body and blood of Christ and yet to say that it is incorporeal.[4]

Schwabe claims that no other contemporary grasped so clearly Berengar's meaning or expressed it so concisely.[5] But while Hugh does not stumble about among the implications of the Berengarian doctrine, proceeding directly to its centre, and dealing frankly with its content, yet his apprehension of Berengar's meaning appears to be only one degree clearer than that of other orthodox writers. He perceives that the fundamental principle of Berengar's teaching is that the nature and essence of the bread and wine are not changed, and that the body of Christ has an intellectual existence only, by which is meant that it is incorporeal [6]—that is to say, it has no real existence in the sacrament.

Hugh's criticism starts from an entirely different angle from that of Berengar. It springs from the doctrine of the change of essence. 'The body which you say is incorporeal Christ offered palpably.' [7] If the nature and essence of the bread and wine remain unchanged after consecration, no change has taken place.[1] If that which is joined to the bread and wine [2]—the body of Christ—is effected by a mental concept only, there is no means of understanding the nature of His body, which up to that point did not exist.[3] Hugh places his finger on the fundamental weakness of eucharistic symbolism, when divorced from the Neo-Platonic idea of the reality existing in the archetype. He argues that it is a mistake to suppose that the intellect is a creative principle. It can discuss essences and form conclusions on them, it can supply demonstrations and representations of them, but it is not their creator, nor can it change their nature.[4] Moreover, if the sacrament is identical with the body which was born and suffered solely for the purpose of winning salvation for men, it has no special connection with the Author of salvation, and we might as well say that Baptism, or any other sacrament concerned with salvation, is the body of the Lord. It is equivalent to saying that Caesar's business is that of the nobles.[5]

---

[1] Migne, 142, 1325–1334.
[2] Geiselmann, p. 309.
[3] Migne, 142, 1238d, 1334a.
[4] *Ibid.* 1326d.
[5] P. 28.
[6] Migne, 142, 1327a.
[7] *Ibid.*

The sacrament is impotent if the bread and wine do not contain the virtue of salvation in their essence and nature, but remain material. If that which is called the body of Christ retains the material bread, it has no effectiveness.[6] Either the nature of the bread must be completely removed, or we must not presume to call it the body of Christ.[7] If the nature of anything is retained, its qualities remain.[8] Do you say that the water turned into wine remained water and yet was wine; or do you deny that it was wine? So likewise the body is not bread save to the taste. Moreover, the argument leads to the conclusion that when the elements are consumed, the incorruptible body of Christ is destroyed with them.[9] But herein

---

[1] Migne, 142, 1327a–b.

[2] Hugh accurately estimates Berengar's criticism of 'assumtio.' *Cf. supra*, p. 255 f.

[3] Migne, 142, 1327b.

[4] *Ibid.*: 'Est enim intellectus essentiarum discussor, non opifex, judex non institutor.'

[5] *Ibid.*: If Hugh here attributes his statement to Berengar, such an idea is not to be found in Berengar's writings. It appears to be an assumption made from Berengar's teaching by his critic.

[6] *Ibid.* 1327c.

[7] *Ibid.*: 'aut panem omnino a sua natura dejicias aut ipsum Christi corpus dicere non presumas.'

[8] *Ibid.* 1327d.

[9] *Ibid.*

Hugh states the physiological problem of realism which its metaphysics never solved. On his premises the body of Christ is not destroyed, because the bread is translated into itself and so becomes indestructible, a manifest denial of physiological processes. Berengar conserved the indestructibility of the body of Christ by denying that it was in the bread.

On this unsafe foundation Hugh of Langres developed his positive theory of the real presence. 'What is incorruptible cannot be destroyed. Fire is not destroyed when smitten, nor the air by a flying arrow.[1] Nor is the body of Christ made less by the repeated communions at human altars, any more than the light which feeds the eyes.'[2] Quoting Ambrose[3] he identifies the eucharistic body with the flesh and blood born of the Virgin: 'from this very material the fruits of the sacrament proceed.' This bread feeds us with so great a power that we are incorporated with Christ to the very marrow and are suckled in faith. By this means we become the sons of God. By this immortal food we are increased, while He is not decreased.[4]

Thus the superstructure which Hugh erects is much firmer than his foundation. When his theory of the real presence is separated from his denial of the existence of the nature of the bread and wine after consecration, it represents a big step in the advance of orthodox doctrine. If the sacrament possesses the effectiveness of the body of Christ as the dynamic symbolists maintained, then, Hugh argued, the body of Christ must be present in the sacrament as a working or effective principle.[5] Whereas Radbert had only reduced the function of symbolism for the theology of metabolism, Hugh deliberately separated himself from it, and laid the foundation for the elevation of the Eucharist, in a special manner, above other sacraments. So he apprehends the sacramental content personally, in the sense of the Incarnation, as a divine-human personality.[1]

---

[1] Migne, 142, 1327d.

[2] *Ibid.* 1331b.

[3] *De Myst.*, ix. (Migne, 16, 407).

[4] Migne, 142, 1328d, 1330b f.

[5] An idea which goes back possibly to Justin Martyr (*Apol.*, i. 66), and certainly to Irenæus (*Hær.*, v. 7, 2). The conception of the influence of a non-personal Logos—*i.e.* the divinity—in the Eucharist was present in the teaching of Haymo, Remi of Auxerre, and Heriger of Lobbes (*cf.* Migne, 117, 564c′; 101, 1260d; 139, 187a–b), and in the anonymous *Dicta Cujusdam Sapientis de Corp. et Sang.* (Migne, 112, 1517d; *cf.* Geiselmann, p. 237).

His only concession to subjective thought lies in his reference to the 'presence' as a 'mystery.' If you do not walk by faith, in what will the mystery consist?[2] The mystical incorporation with Christ is refused to those who receive unworthily.[3] The mystery is sacrificial. Christ is at once the altar, the priest, the offering, and the sacrificial tabernacle,[4] and, being a mystery, physical difficulties are overcome as Chrysostom showed.[5]

The same principle of Christ's presence as the unit of action or effectiveness lies behind his theory of the process of the change. While using Ambrosian terms,[6] the general agent is the might and will of God,[7] and the range of divine power extends beyond the boundary of the senses.[8] Nature's laws may be unchangeable, but they yield to the will of God.[9] He who is able to create can also transform.[10] He effects the change by a hidden power of re-creation, through the operation of the invisible Spirit of God. In the Book of Wisdom we read that nature is so arranged that it can change itself in the service of God. So invisible forms clothe themselves with the visible, or are completely changed, as when water is turned into wine.[11] Hugh was the first of the metabolists to grasp firmly the process.[12] The bread and wine are so subject to God that the fixedness of their nature can be changed with invisible swiftness and transfigured into Him in whom all things are, or to whom they all belong, into the man Christ,[13] who is the specific agent of the change, and so the body comes into existence through the act of the re-creating God.[14]

The creature passes over into the body of Christ.[15] A parallel can be found in the Incarnation, when the Word, although in the flesh, was invisible. The same flesh is now made invisible for necessary reasons. To make it suitable to the taste and to avoid horror, it is hidden in the qualities of bread and wine.[1] Thus, in Hugh's teaching, the nature of the elements is surrendered, but the species remain. The element ceases to be a principle of action,[2] and is incorporated in Christ as the unit of action,[3] without complete loss of existence, since it retains its flavour, although only in the subjective sense apprehended by the recipient, for the qualities do not exist objectively.[4] So he strengthens the fundamental concept of his realism, which is based on the idea of the disappearance of the elements.[5] It is a metabolism which resembles the Greek assumption theory. But it cannot be denied that with the taking-up of the elements into the sacramental reality, which follows the change, the element has lost the qualities which gave it existence. It possesses now only appearance or form, and only the sacramental reality, the body and blood remain for our apprehension. The difference between this doctrine and Transubstantiation in the special sense is very narrow. Once the Aristotelean doctrine of substance and accidence is applied to the theory of the change, the significance of *forma* and *species* in the sense of accidence becomes the final conclusion.[6]

---

[1] *Cf.* Geiselmann, p. 315. [2] Migne, 142, 1332b. [3] *Ibid.* 1329d.

[4] *Ibid.* 1332b–d. [5] *Ibid.* 1332b, 1328c.

[6] *Ibid.*: 'transfigurare' (1329c), 'transformare' (1328c–d), 'mutare' (1327a). *Cf.* Geiselmann, p. 312.

[7] Migne, 142, 1328b, d. [8] *Ibid.* 1327a [9] *Ibid.* 1328a–b.

[10] *Ibid.* 1328d. [11] *Ibid.* 1329c. [12] Geiselmann, p. 315.

[13] Migne, 142, 1329c: 'Huic maxime convenit sacramento, in quo panis et vini creatura Deo sic deservire probatur, ut perseverantiam quam exhibuerat naturae, invisibili celeritate permutet et se in omnia transfigurans, hoc est in eum, in quo omnia sunt, aut qui omnium est, homo Christus.'

[14] *Ibid.* 1329c: 'Corpus ejus ipso Recreatore fiat.'

[15] *Ibid.* 1330b: 'in ipsa quae in Christi corpus transit creatura.'

The book of Durand of Troarn, *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*,[7] is the first exhaustive treatise on the Eucharist which appeared in our period. It makes use of more orthodox phraseology than the lengthy epistle of Hugh of Langres, and while, like all medieval writings which discussed the theory of the Eucharist, Durand's book suffers from repetition and some verbosity, it marks a farther stage in advance upon the development of the doctrine of Transubstantiation presented by Hugh of Langres.

Durand attacks the use of the words 'figura' and 'similitudo' made by the Berengarians, although he frankly admits that they play a necessary part in the presentation of

---

[1] Migne, 142, 1330d–1331a.

[2] 'Wirkprinzip' (Geiselmann, p. 315).

[3] Migne, 142, 1330c: 'sibi corporavit.' 'Wirkeinheit' (Geiselmann, p. 315).

[4] *Ibid.* 142, 1330d (Geiselmann, p. 316).

[5] *Supra*, p. 274.

[6] Geiselmann, p. 316.

[7] Migne, 149, 1375–1424.

Catholic doctrine. He goes to the heart of Berengar's system by pointing out that the teaching of the latter allows for no reality in the sacrament, but he exaggerates Berengar's bias when he contends that he teaches a bare symbolism. The sacrament is not that which it represents.[1] Durand's criticism is really directed against a theory which has been attributed to Zwingli,[2] not the ancient dynamic symbolism criticised by Hugh of Langres. Durand urges that while the Eucharist is in some respects symbolical [3] it is not symbolism without an actual content. If it signifies or symbolises the Lord's death, it is the means by which reconciliation with God is effected.[4] Baptism symbolises death, but it possesses a real content, it is a true and efficacious sacrament. In the same way (quoting the Ambrosian *De Sacramentis*), although we receive the symbol of blood in the Eucharist, it is also true blood.[5] There is a double process in Communion. On the one hand His death is symbolically recollected, on the other His real presence is experienced. He is spiritually seen, actually experienced, and undoubtedly possessed.[6] Similitude is permitted lest the horror created by the actual flesh should keep men away from Communion, but the body is none the less actually present.[7] Symbolism is an accommodation to human sensibility,[8] and for this reason the sacrament has two aspects—the external appearance and the internal actuality. It is a mystery.[9]

This distinction between outward appearance and inner reality is another indication of the progressive character of Durand's thought. It is a new step in the attempt to define the difference between the eucharistic species and their spiritual significance. But the failure of his attempt to reconcile symbolism and realism is revealed when he endeavours to define 'similitudo' and 'figura' in a realist sense. Christ offered two sacrifices, one at the institution of the sacrament, and the other on the cross, and the former pre-signified the latter.[1] Eve was made 'similar' to Adam, but none the less she had the same nature and the same condition. She had flesh like Adam. So also, although the bread and wine are a similitude of the flesh and blood of Christ, yet the sacramental elements are really His body and blood.[2] In the same way, if Christ is said to have been made in the similitude of a man, He actually possesses manhood.[3] But this is to explain symbolism in the alleged Greek sense.[4] The symbol is actually that which it represents, a conception foreign to Berengar's teaching.

---

[1] Migne, 149, 1377a: 'nihil in sacramentis Dominicis ad veritatem fieri, sed omnia potius per figuram et similitudinem geri'; 1383a: 'crassamque similitudinis ac figurae nubem improbe consectatur'; 1387a: 'in quibus solam esse figuram, et non veritatem affirmant.'

[2] Recent research indicates that Zwingli was not a mere memorialist.

[3] Migne, 149, 1398a: 'licet figura, juxta aliquod dicatur.'

[4] *Ibid.* 1392b: 'mortis est Dominicae significativum reconciliationisque humanae effectivum.' *Cf.* 1382a.

[5] *Ibid.* 1396b.

[6] *Ibid.* 1381d: 'me videre spiritualiter, sentire praesentaliter, habere valeatis indubitanter.'

[7] *Ibid.* 1396c: 'similitudo, ut cruoris auferatur penitus horror . . . unde jam de similitudine superducta, ob certae rei gratiam . . . corpus, ait, est quod accipies in veritate.' *Cf.* 1396b.

[8] *Ibid.* 1396c.

[9] *Ibid.* 1380b–c: 'similitudinem forinsecus apparentem . . . veritatem intrinsecus'; 1396a: 'similitudo igitur exterior, veritati non praejudicat interiori.'

He perceives that the manna was a bare symbol of the Eucharist, because the manna really was what it appeared to be. It did not represent something other than it really was. When the apostle said that manna was a figure of the Eucharist, he was referring to mere similarity between the manna and sacramental bread, not to any similarity of inward reality.[5] A 'figure' may possess the form of the reality, as the writer to the Hebrews said when he described the Son as the image of the Father's being.[6] But if the conception of 'figura' rules out that of substance, then the Son is not what the Father is. Similarly, if the sacrament, which likewise is called 'figura,' is only a shade (umbra) it has no reality.[7] But if on the contrary the Son, who is called a 'figure,' is yet of the divine substance, so can the word 'figure' be used of the sacrament without contradicting its reality. The Eucharist is then a figure of the Divine Substance, and the manna is a figure of this figure, the one is reality, the other is a mere similarity.[8]

---

[1] Migne, 149, 1381b. [2] *Ibid.* 1393b. [3] *Ibid.* 1393c.

[4] I have discussed Greek symbolism and its relation to Western thought in the chapter on 'The Greek and Latin Fathers' in *The Evangelical Doctrine of Holy Communion* shortly to be published.

[5] Migne, 149, 1394a: 'eundem scilicet per potentiam significativae figurae, non per veritatem exhibitae naturae.'

[6] *Ibid.* 1393c: 'figura substantiae ejus.'

[7] *Ibid.* 1394d: 'sacramentum dum similiter dicitur figura, umbra est non veritas.'

[8] *Ibid.* 1394a–b.

Durand's conception of symbolism is thus merely nominal. In the most favourable light it represents an old Greek idea, but when laid bare it proves to be but little removed from the Paschasian realism. Although something different appears to human eyes, although as a type it is not denied that it usefully signifies something different, the sacramental element is actually nothing else substantially than the true flesh and blood of Christ.[1] So he really inverts the significance of eucharistic symbolism. The elements being substantially body and blood, are only the symbols of bread and wine, and there is a sense in which symbolism constitutes a hindrance to the conception of the real presence.[2] This inversion of the significance of symbolism, by setting up the elements as symbols of the bread and wine, has been noticed before in the old Gallic liturgies and in Amalry's teaching,[3] and it will occur again in the phraseology of Lanfranc.[4]

If Durand's criticism of symbolism breaks down, his positive contribution to the development of the doctrine of Transubstantiation is more successful. The real flesh and blood of Christ are available to us through the process of the Incarnation,[5] which makes possible a communion with His flesh,[6] so that we remain naturally in Him, and thus we feed on the divine.[7] Durand's argument reverses the significance of the Incarnation for the purpose of eucharistic feeding. In the hypostatic union of God and man in Christ, the divine Christ assumes flesh, but in that union man also, by way of the sacrament, is united with Christ. We are made the throne and kingdom of the divinity, we are transfigured from the human into the divine, and are led from the carnal to the spiritual.[8] The cause of our life is the presence of the

---

[1] Migne, 149, 1386d : 'Quod quamvis aliud humanis cernatur obtutibus, quamvis aliud significare utiliter ratione typica non negetur, nihil tamen aliud omnino substantialiter esse quam vera Christi caro et verus sanguis comprobatur.'

[2] *Ibid.* 1396c : 'Corpus, ait, est quod accipias in veritate, cui similitudo militat dispensatione.'

[3] *Supra*, p. 243. *Cf.* Feltoe, *J.T.S.* (1910), p. 575 ff.; Batiffol, *L'Eucharistie* (1920), p. 366 ff.

[4] *Infra*, p. 293 f.

[5] Migne, 149, 1382b, 1382d, 1383a, 1385b.

[6] *Ibid.* 1382b : 'in Christo per sanctae suae carnis commercium naturaliter manemus.' *Cf.* 1383a.

[7] *Ibid.* 1383b : 'humanam posse naturam ad divinae carnis pertingere edulium.'

[8] *Ibid.*

Word-Flesh in us.[1] He becomes ordinary food for us.[2] We receive that flesh in pledge of the firm hope of glory.[3]

Durand develops the idea of Hugh of Langres that when we receive the dominical food we are identified with the divine-human personality of Christ. The medium of our union with the body of Christ in communion is our own flesh which He had assumed at the Incarnation. But he goes a step farther, and begins the philosophical grounding of metabolism by stating that the body of Christ is present substantially,[4] not as the mere principle of action [5] energised by the Incarnation, whereby the eucharistic metabolism is effected by a change of the nature of bread and wine into that of body and blood. While Hugh of Langres speaks of a *natural* presence of the body of Christ, Durand defines this as a *substantial* presence. Durand supplements Hugh's conception of the presence of the flesh of the Word by virtue of the incarnate nature of the Word, with the idea of the Word-Flesh,[6] in which the reality of the presence of divinity is more strongly stressed. Probably no earlier use of the word 'substantialiter' can be traced, if Durand's book was written by 1058. The doctrine of the real presence was passing into a theory of Transubstantiation, and the term 'substantialiter' was soon to be popularised by Guitmund. The terminology of Transubstantiation was still only in process of formation. Durand himself wavers; he was not satisfied with the term 'substantial,' and in one passage describes the bread of the Eucharist as super-substantial, which passes not into the body of the recipient, but supports the substance of the soul.[7] With this passage must be read another in which he appears to conceive of a phase of the sacrament when the consecrated elements constitute only a part of the body of Christ. This is before it is received by the worshipper. It becomes the whole body after reception.[1] Was Durand groping with halting steps after a distinction between the eucharistic body and the glorified body of Christ, with the object of limiting the term 'substance' to the eucharistic body? If so he was hindered by his conception of the eucharistic body as the medium of union with the spiritual body of Christ, which in turn he apprehends in the ancient sense as the source of eternal life,[2] and the term 'substantial' accurately represents his idea of the nature of the eucharistic content. But like all the orthodox writers of this period of the controversy, he cannot break away from the Ambrosian-Paschasian identification of the eucharistic body with the historical body of Christ. It is the true and natural substance of the flesh and blood of Christ,[3] derived from the Virgin Mary, which suffered on the cross,[4] although the food is not corporal but spiritual.[5] So that his attempt, shared by Hugh of Langres, to raise the whole discussion to a loftier plane, by incorporating the idea of the hypostatic union of the Incarnation, does not become finally effective.

---

[1] Migne, 149, 1383d. [2] *Ibid.* 1384a: 'nobis usualis fieret esca.'

[3] *Ibid.* 1384a: 'in pignore.' *Cf.* 1384b: 'peridoneum pignus.'

[4] *Ibid.* 1386d: 'omnino substantialiter esse quam vera Christi caro et verus sanguis comprobatur'; 1405a: 'substantialiter corpus et sanguis creduntur esse, non aliqua phantasmatis vacua imagine.'

[5] Geiselmann, p. 327.

[6] Migne, 149, 1382d: 'vere nihilominus eadem Verbi caro, ac potius Verbum caro, et non per cessam veritatis figuram in cibo sumi credenda est.'

[7] *Ibid.* 1389b: 'supersubstantialem, non qui vadit in corpus sed qui animae nostrae substantiam fulcit,' commenting on Augustine's use of 'supersubstantialem.'

His theory of the process of the eucharistic change again resembles that of Hugh. The real or substantial presence of the body of Christ is effected by a sudden change in the elements,[6] not in their form but in their nature,[7] not a visible change, for the body of Christ remains invisible.[8] The process is mysterious,[1] something terrible in its magnitude,[2] to be reverenced and believed rather than discussed.[3] The change is effected on the human side by the mystical prayer of the priest, on the divine side by the operation of the Holy Spirit, and stress is laid on the Spirit's action.[4] But in this operation the Word of Christ shares,[5] and here he appears to have in view the words of institution.[6] Controlling the whole operation is the will of God, who can do whatever He wills.[7]

---

[1] Migne, 149, 1379b: 'divinum mysterium fideliter et competenter acceptum, et in id quod jam ex parte erat, ab eo quod adhuc visui subjacebat exteriori, divinitus ex toto transformatum.' Geiselmann, p. 325, offers this interpretation with hesitation. Heurtevent, p. 224, gives a similar translation, but stresses the idea of a 'translation' not into a new body (*cf.* Paschasius), but into that which already exists in heaven.

[2] Migne, 149, 1384d, 1386a, 1389b.

[3] *Ibid.* 1393b: 'substantivum verumque constat corpus ipsius'; 1411c: 'vera et naturalis Christi carnis et sanguinis substantia'; 1409d: 'vera probatur substantia carnis Dominicae.'

[4] *Ibid.* 1383c, 1385c, 1387b–c.

[5] *Ibid.* 1385c: 'Non ergo corporalis esca est, sed spiritualis est.'

[6] *Ibid.* 1379a: 'a specie visibili in id repente transformari.'

[7] *Ibid.* 1380a: 'mutata non specie, sed natura'; 1405a: 'rerum temporalium in vivificam carnis et sanguinis veramque naturam coelitus mutatione.'

[8] *Ibid.* 1380b: 'sub visibilis rei obtentu'; 1380a: 'ad invisibilem speciem . . . perducitur . . . visibilis forma.'

Durand uses the term ' species ' in two senses, sometimes in its usual significance, when he applies it to the outward appearance of the bread and wine,[8] and also to describe the hidden presence of the sacramental body.[9] It is then equivalent to ' veritas ' or actuality.

Like Anastasius and Theoduin, Durand had conducted a wide research for a writer in that age. He quotes the Epistle of Clement, Hilary, Basil, Chrysostom, Rufinus, Leo the Great, the pseudo-Eusebius of Emesa, Cassiodorus, Gregory of Tours, the deacon John, and especially Ambrose and Augustine. He shows an acquaintance with the writers from the eighth to the tenth centuries, a qualification shared by no other writer on the Eucharist in his own age. He quotes Bede, Hincmar of Reims, Paschasius, 'the most diligent student of the divine sacrament and Catholic controversialist,'[10] Amalry, and Fulbert of Chartres.[11] He frankly admits that Augustine's teaching on symbolism in the Eucharist had inspired the Berengarian criticism of realist doctrine.[12] But Augustine's use of the terms 'figura,' 'signum,' 'typus' does not militate against the doctrine of the real presence,[1] for he identified the eucharistic body with the historical body of Jesus. But in order to prove this contention, he totally inverts the meaning of one Augustinian passage by changing ' non ' into ' nam.' [2]

---

[1] Migne, 149, 1401b: 'per mysterium passionem ipsius repraesentat Unigeniti'; 1396d: 'majestas mysterii . . . corporis sui et sanguinis mysteria.'

[2] *Ibid.* 1417c: 'De cujus magnitudine, terribile.'

[3] *Ibid.* 1417c: 'magisque reverenda quam discutienda'; 1400a: 'hoc capere vel disserere nequeamus'; 1401a: 'credendum est potius quam discutiendum.'

[4] *Ibid.* 1379d, 1380a.

[5] *Ibid.* 1385a–c, 1388a–b, 1407a.

[6] *Ibid.* 1385c.

[7] *Ibid.* 1379d, 1405d.

[8] *Ibid.* 1405a: 'etsi videantur in priore qua deferuntur specie'; 1409d: 'in illo specie tenus pane vera probatur substantia carnis Dominicae.' *Cf.* 1397d.

[9] *Ibid.* 1388c: 'species id est, veritas carnis ac sanguinis in sacramento latet'; 1395d: 'speciem, id est veritatem . . . quae intus est.'

[10] *Ibid.* 1389c.

[11] On the researches of Durand *cf.* Heurtevent, p. 244 f.

[12] Migne, 149, 1410d, 1411b, 1414d, 1415a, 1417a.

The climax of the orthodox defence of the Ambrosian-Radbertian doctrine of the identification of the eucharistic body with the historical flesh of Christ was reached in the definition of belief submitted by Humbert to Berengar at the Roman Council of 1059, where the ' true body and blood of Christ ' were stated to be materially (sensualiter) present in the Eucharist when they were actually handled and broken by the priest and ground by the teeth of the faithful.[3] No more gross statement of the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist has ever been made. Not only have later Catholic writers sought to explain away the crude realism of Humbert, by resorting to the theory of the ' communicatio idiomatum,' or by limiting the conception of the breaking of the body to the eucharistic species,[4] but later definitions of the dogma have frankly reduced the terminology of Humbert. This does not mean that the development of Catholic dogma ceased with Humbert. The theory of Transubstantiation had still to be developed. It was not a leading subject of inquiry among orthodox writers during the first phase of the controversy, although the fact of a change, and some discussion of its method, was noted by them under the stress of Berengar's criticism, which had already raised the point,[5] and he, like his opponents, does not lay emphasis upon it until a later stage in the dispute. The first phase of the Berengarian controversy was occupied by the orthodox writers with establishing the doctrine of the real presence.

[1] Migne, 149, 1379c, 1389b, 1399c, 1412a, 1416d.

[2] *Ibid.* 1412d : ' nam hoc corpus videtis manducaturi estis.' Augustine, *En. in Psa.*, *98* (Migne, 37, 1265), has ' non.' *Cf.* Geiselmann, p. 323 (but he wrongly assigns the passage to Augustine, *In Joan.*, Tr. xxvi.). Schnitzer, p. 335, tries to attribute the reading ' non ' to Berengar, but has to admit (footnote 2) that Lanfranc and Guitmund also give the correct reading ' non.'

[3] *Supra*, p. 130.

[4] Schnitzer, p. 240 nn. 1–2, gives an extensive list of Catholic critics of the formula.

[5] Martène and Durand, iv. 111e.

CHAPTER XV

BERENGAR'S 'OPUSCULUM' AND LANFRANC'S REPLY

Second Stage of the Controversy.

SOON after the Council of 1059 Berengar assembled his opinions on the Eucharist, and published them in the form of a 'little book' which Lanfranc said he had received 'to be destroyed,' [1] doubtless under the order of the Roman authorities, who had condemned all Berengar's writings. The time when this treatise was written is indicated by internal statements, which show that one of Berengar's objects in writing it was the refutation of Cardinal Humbert, and the recantation of the oath which the latter had drawn up for him to swear at Rome in 1059. Only fragments of the treatise survive. They have been preserved in Lanfranc's *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*.[2] Sufficient remains to show that Berengar's views had become more definite since he wrote the long epistle to Adelmann, and in the 'Opusculum' we have the main lines, or at least a series of texts, for his longer work, the *De Sacra Cœna*.

The opinion of Paschasius and Lanfranc that the substance of bread and wine does not remain on the altar after consecration is madness.[3] If they say that the bread and wine of the altar are only sacraments, or only true body and blood of Christ, in either case, he contends, they admit that the bread and wine remain;[4] just as when Scripture says that Christ is the chief corner-stone, the statement does not do away with Christ, but unreservedly asserts that He 'is.'[5] Not every statement remains valid if either of its premises is removed,[6] so that both predicate and object in these statements must be maintained. The subject bread and wine remains, whether it is predicated of a sacrament or of the true body and blood of Christ.[1] Thus Humbert, in spite of his denial, cannot escape the conclusion that the bread and wine remain in the consecrated elements.[2]

---

[1] Migne, 150, 415b.
[2] *Ibid.* 407–426.
[3] *Ibid.* 412d.
[4] *Ibid.* 414d.
[5] *Ibid.* 415d.
[6] *Ibid.* 416d.

As in the epistle to Adelmann, his constructive theory is derived from Augustine.[3] A sacrament is a 'sacred sign.'[4] A sign is something beyond the form (species) which it conveys to the senses, causing something different from itself to enter into perception.[5] But sacraments must have the similitude of the things of which they are sacraments, otherwise they cannot be sacraments.[6] The signs of spiritual things are visible, but invisible things are honoured in them. The species which has been sanctified by consecration may not be degraded to ordinary use.[7]

Consecration produces an effect on the bread and wine. They become the agents of spiritual life.[8] It gives them a religious value, but they do not cease to exist; while remaining, they are changed into something else.[9] A new significance is added to them, that of the heavenly body of Christ. A sacrament has two parts, it is *prepared* from two things, the visible and the invisible, the sacrament and the thing of the sacrament. The latter is the body of Christ and would be visible if it were before the eyes, but as it is raised up in heaven, sitting at the right hand of the Father until the end of the world, as S. Peter writes, existing in Christ's Person as God and man,[10] it cannot be recalled. From one point of view the sacraments are the body and blood of Christ, as baptism is faith,[11] for the sacrament represents the sacrifice of Christ, who was once sacrificed in Himself, and is sacrificed in the daily offerings, and not only at Easter.[1]

---

[1] Migne, 150, 418c. [2] *Ibid.* 421a. [3] *Ibid.* 422b.

[4] *Ibid.* 422b, quoting Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, x. 5 (Hoffmann, xl. pt. ii. 452).

[5] Migne, 150, 422d; Augustine, *De Doc. Christ.* (Migne, 34, 35).

[6] Migne, 150, 422d; Augustine, 'Epis. 98 to Boniface' (Goldbacher, pp. 34, 531).

[7] Migne, 150, 423a, quoting Augustine, *De Cat. Rud.*, xxvi. (Migne, 40, 314 f.).

[8] Migne, 150, 421d, quoting Augustine, *In Joan.*, Tr. xxvi. 13 (Migne, 35, 1612 f., 1616 f.).

[9] Migne, 150, 419c, quoting the Ambrosian *De Sacramentis*.

[10] *Ibid.* 421a.

[11] *Ibid.* 423d, quoting Augustine, 'Epis. 98 to Boniface' (Goldbacher, p. 531).

But Lanfranc has broken off Berengar's statement with Augustine's quotation, yet the latter clearly did not conceive of the sacrifice in a realist sense because he maintains that it is contrary to reason, and there is no miraculous intervention by which the bread is broken as the body of Christ, for since the Resurrection Christ lives incorruptible, and cannot be recalled from heaven till the restoration of all things.[2] If the bread is changed into the flesh of Christ, one of two contingencies occurs. Either the bread is raised to heaven, or the flesh of Christ is brought down to earth. Yet neither occurs, and so the bread is not changed into actual flesh.[3] That which Lanfranc calls the true body of Christ is described in Scripture as species, similitude, figure, sign, mystery, sacrament. But these words refer to other things, and nothing which refers to something else can be that to which it refers. So it is not the body of Christ.[4]

Berengar's idea of consecration at this period is made clear by his use of the term 'conficitur.'[5] The elements are prepared, or are given the significance of the body of Christ, which is in heaven, and not in the sacrament. At this early stage he was content to do little more than repeat the criticism directed by Ratramn against the theory of a change of essence. He does not yet expound it dialectically.[6] While no doubt the sections of the treatise left unquoted by Lanfranc would have brought out more clearly, and with better sequence, Berengar's criticism of Humbert, there need be no hesitation in concluding that Lanfranc has preserved the most important passages. As all these extracts are repeated, and most of them expanded, in the *De Sacra Cœna*, they call for no further comment here.

To this period of the controversy belongs the Epistle of

---

[1] Migne, 150, 425a, quoting Augustine (Goldbacher, p. 530 f.).

[2] Migne, 150, 426d.

[3] *Ibid.* 439b.

[4] *Ibid.* 436a. Lanfranc says this statement appears in one of Berengar's writings. It occurs in the 'Epis. to Adelmann' (Martène and Durand, iv. 110b).

[5] Migne, 150, 421a.

[6] Geiselmann, p. 335.

Eusebius Bruno, Bishop of Angers, to Berengar,[1] although Eusebius makes no reference to the 'Opusculum.' The Bishop of Angers takes refuge behind those who were more learned than himself.[2] He will have nothing to do with the 'turbulent streams of disputation,'[3] and is content to appeal to the words of institution as the authority for the interpretation of the Eucharist.[4] After the priest has used this creative word, we believe the bread to be the true body of Christ, and the wine His true blood.[5] If anyone asks how it is done, we reply 'By the almighty power of God,' who does whatever He desires. Like the Incarnation and the miracle by which, after the Resurrection, the body of Jesus could walk through closed doors, the eucharistic mystery is effected by supernatural means.[6] They who desire further information may refer to the writings of the Fathers.[7]

Eusebius makes no contribution to the development of the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist. His letter, which only repeats the language of earlier writers, probably represents the attitude of many contemporaries to the dispute, an attitude which had been maintained by uncontroversial minds in the Western Church since Radbert and Ratramn raised the question in the ninth century. It represented a vague mystical realism. The words of institution showed that the body of Christ was present, but the method of the presence was quite unknown. If Berengar had not asked Eusebius to allow a public disputation on the doctrine of Ambrose,[8] it is probable that Eusebius would not have attempted to define his own belief. The epistle is to be interpreted not so much as an indication of a change in the doctrinal attitude of Eusebius, but rather as a refusal to give Berengar any further practical or political support. To Eusebius Berengar was a subject of political rather than doctrinal interest. It is probable that the doctrinal statement given in the letter represents the views held by Eusebius from the beginning of his relations with Berengar. If he accorded to Berengar any doctrinal latitude, that was because the whole question was for him too deeply wrapped in mystery and difficulty to enable him to judge, or at least to assert, that Berengar was totally in error. But others had now decided the doctrinal question, and so he states his own view simply, and leaves Berengar's teaching unexamined.

---

[1] Migne 147, 1201–1204. Written *c.* 1062.

[2] *Ibid.* 1201d.

[3] *Ibid.* 1202d.

[4] *Ibid.* 1202d, 1203a, 1204a.

[5] *Ibid.* 1203a.

[6] *Ibid.* 1203b.

[7] *Ibid.* 1203c.

[8] *Ibid.* 1201d.

The dialectical formulation of the orthodox opinions begins with Lanfranc's treatise. This was, of course, inspired by Berengar's lost treatise, although it is probable that the Scolasticus did not direct an elaborate dialectical attack, such as appears in the *De Sacra Cœna*, against his opponents, in that work. But if Lanfranc begins the dialectical formulation of Radbertian doctrine, the method was still disregarded, as we shall see, by many orthodox writers. A school of anti-dialectical,[1] as well as dialectical,[2] writers appeared.

Although the day has long gone by since it was supposed that Lanfranc's book was the last word in the dispute between himself and Berengar, yet some writers, and among them Schnitzer, Endres,[3] and Geiselmann, discuss the *De Sacra Cœna* before the *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*.[4] Perhaps the dogmatic theologians have some justification for grouping Berengar's main ideas around one nucleus, but the historical sequence of events and of thought, which is Schnitzer's concern as a historian, is thereby disarranged, a result the less desirable because Berengar does not appear to have produced a thorough formulation of his scheme of thought until after Lanfranc's book appeared.

Lanfranc's distrust of Berengar's critical method dated from the time when, quite early in his career in France, he listened to Berengar's lectures at Tours.[5] But he was too sound a scholar not to perceive the value of dialectics for orthodox theology, within certain well-defined limits, and the caution expressed in his letter to Domnald, Bishop of Dublin,[6] and in his commentary on 1 Corinthians,[1] represents rather a warning against the misuse of philosophy in the field of theology than an unqualified prohibition. Even the dialectical method is not entirely condemned, and he admits that it may be of assistance when rightly used.[2] Several examples of Lanfranc's use of the syllogism appear in his commentaries on S. Paul,[3] and were noticed by Sigebert of Gembloux.[4] In the *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*[5] Lanfranc calls God and his conscience to witness that he will have nothing to do with dialectical propositions or solutions in the interpretation of Scripture,[6] and so attacks the thoroughgoing dialecticism of Berengar, but he cannot resist adopting the method whenever it gives him an opportunity for scoring a point in debate.[7] He makes use of it to reverse Berengar's argument that the comparison of Christ with a chief corner-stone illustrates the symbolical character of the Eucharist.[8] By the same logical device he attempts to defeat Berengar's contention that an enemy of truth necessarily admits the existence of truth.[9] He tries to cover himself by the excuse that if dialectics are to be used, he can give a Roland for Berengar's Oliver.[10] No doubt the debating instincts of the old lawyer of Pavia[11] prevented him from losing any profitable opportunity, but his own inward conviction of the value of logic could be on occasion absolutely repressed, although he has to admit that Augustine made use of the method and sanctioned it.[12] Moreover, he admitted the need for a deeper spiritual interpretation of the Scriptures than was covered by the verbal exegesis of the traditional methods of the day, but shrank from adopting it lest he should be misunderstood.[1] In later days he read through the *Monologion* of Anselm of Bec, and although he warned Anselm not to neglect the traditional authorities, and expressed disapproval of some parts of the work, he raised no objection to the rational method used by Anselm.[2]

---

[1] *Cf.* Geiselmann, p. 396 ff.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 365 ff.

[3] J. A. Endres, *Forschungen zur Geschichte der frühmittelalterlichen Philosophie* (*Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philos. des Mittelalters*, xvii. (1915), Heft 2–3, pp. 38–49). Endres proved finally that the *Elucidarium* was written not by Lanfranc, but by Honorius of Autun (*Beiträge zur Gesch. geistigen Lebens im 12. Jahrh.*, 1906, pp. 22 ff.).

[4] Migne, 150, 407–442; Giles, *Opera Lanfranci*, ii. 147 ff.

[5] Macdonald, p. 10.

[6] Migne, 150, 533d.

---

[1] Migne, 155, 155c, 158b, 159b, 163b, with the glosses in the text. *Cf.* N. Tamassia, *Lanfranco Arcivescovo di Canterbury e la Scula Pavese* (*Mélanges Fitting*, ii., 1908, 195 ff.) for indications of Lanfranc's legal knowledge in the Pauline commentaries.

[2] Migne, 155, 158b: 'Hos adnihilatos esse perhibet, non quia doctrinas eorum omnifariam improbet, in multis enim sacris litteris concordant. . . .'

[3] *Ibid.* 147a, 150a, 166a, 168c, 178b, 182b, 194a, 198 (gloss on 1 Cor. xii. 15); 201 (gloss on 1 Cor. xiv. 1); 207 (gloss on 1 Cor. xv. 6); 266 (gloss on Gal. ii. 23); 271a, 273b. *Cf.* Endres, *Beiträge zur Gesch. der Philos. des M.-A.*, p. 123.

[4] Migne, 160, 582c. *Cf.* Endres, p. 122 f.

[5] Migne, 150, 416d.

[6] *Ibid.* 417a.

[7] Endres, *Görresgesellschaft Phil. Jahrbuch*, xix. 32, points out that prejudice rather than conviction influenced Lanfranc's criticism of Berengar's dialectics. Lanfranc stood at the eve of scholastic speculation. *Cf.* Geyer, *Die Pat. und Scol. Phil.*, p. 191.

[8] Migne, 150, 416c.

[9] *Ibid.* 412c.

[10] *Ibid.* 417a.

[11] *Cf.* Tamassia, ii. 189 ff.

[12] Migne, 150, 417a–c.

Lanfranc starts from the general proposition that faith is preferable to reason as an instrument of interpretation.[3] There are things which the human mind cannot understand, but must be patiently and humbly believed.[4] They are rather to be believed by the testimony of faith than investigated by reason.[5] Yet he resorts to the dialectical method to overthrow Berengar's contention that in either of the propositions, 'The bread and wine of the altar are only sacraments,' or 'The bread and wine of the altar are only true body and blood of Christ,' the statement admits the survival of the material elements of bread and wine.[6] The first of these alternatives, says Lanfranc, which was Berengar's, was condemned at Rome in 1059.[7] The second was not held by anyone, least of all by the Church, because the Church, while maintaining the existence of the body and blood, also admitted a symbolical presence of the bread and wine.[8] Berengar argued that if one part of this proposition were overthrown, the whole of it fell to the ground.[9] Lanfranc rightly replied that this defence broke down, because his major premise, 'Not every proposition can stand when part has been overthrown,'[10] was a negative 'particular,' whereas a 'universal' was required, viz. 'No affirmation can stand, part being overthrown.'[11] Again, according to Berengar, both of his alternatives concerning the bread and wine were major propositions. Lanfranc contended that as they were particulars, the rule of formal logic could not be applied, and no general conclusion could be drawn from them.[1]

---

[1] Migne, 150, 163b.
[2] *Ibid.* 158, 1134, 1138.
[3] *Ibid.* 150, 427a–b.
[4] *Ibid.* 439d.
[5] *Ibid.* 440b.
[6] *Ibid.* 414d.
[7] *Ibid.* 415a.
[8] *Ibid.* 416a, 416c, 436b. Lanfranc's argument is hardly relevant, because he has inverted Berengar's use of symbolism. Berengar maintained a symbolical presence of body and blood.
[9] *Ibid.* 416d.
[10] *Ibid.*: 'Non enim constare poterit affirmatio omnis parte subruta.'
[11] *Ibid.* 417d: 'Ad cujus rei probationem non oportuit inferri particularem negationem, qua de praesenti quaestione nihil colligitur, sed universalem potius, per quam enuntiatur, nulla affirmatio constare poterit parte subruta. Age, enim particularis sit negatio tua, non omnis affirmatio constare poterit parte subruta.'

An interesting discussion on the point has arisen among the logicians. Von Prantl criticised Lanfranc's interpretation of Berengar's premise as a particular, and charged Lanfranc with distorting Berengar's words, which really had a general significance and meant 'The proposition cannot stand in its totality if a portion of it is gone.'[2] Endres, in turn, rightly charges Von Prantl with misunderstanding Lanfranc, who, according to Endres, was not concerned with the debatable contents of Berengar's major premise, but contented himself with showing the formal inadmissibility of Berengar's method of conclusion.[3] Yet Endres admits that Lanfranc pointed out that Berengar's major premise must be a general negative in order to lead on to a conclusion ; moreover he confuses the issue by reading Berengar's statement in the light of his later explanation given in the *De Sacra Cœna*. He says that Berengar applied the rule—an affirmative proposition falls to the ground if either correlate, subjective or predicative, is overthrown—but that Berengar was too doubtful of the validity of his premises to state it as a general proposition, and so expressed it as a particular 'Non constare poterit affirmatio omnis parte subruta,'[4] with the final result, even if 'non omnis'='nullus,' that every affirmative statement becomes impossible when used of objects belonging to past time.[5] But Endres' suggestion is equivalent to conceding Von Prantl's criticism of Lanfranc, and, if allowed to stand, it removes the point of Lanfranc's acute reply, which criticised Berengar for not resorting to some such universal. It may be admitted that Berengar intended to set up a general proposition, but he himself confessed later that he had expressed himself too loosely, and restated his premise—as Endres says—and, although claiming that his argument was still valid on other grounds, allowed the cogency of Lanfranc's criticism.[1]

---

[1] Migne, 150, 417d–418a : 'rursus assumptio tua : Panis et vinum altaris solummodo sunt sacramentum, vel panis et vinum altaris solummodo sunt verum Christi corpus et sanguis, utrumque affirmatio est. His duabus particularibus praecedentibus, poterisne regulariter concludere, parte subruta, ea non posse constare ? Absit ! In nulla quippe syllogismorum figura, praecedentibus duabus particularibus consequenter infertur conclusio ulla. Male igitur eam collocasti.' *Cf.* Endres, *Görresgesellschaft. Phil. Jahrbuch*, xxvi. 168.

[2] *Gesch. der Logik*, ii. 76 n. 308.

[3] *Beiträge*, xvii. 127.

[4] *D.S.C.*, p. 110 f. *Infra*, p. 306. Endres, *Beiträge*, xvii. 126. Dieckhoff, p. 51 n., thinks that Berengar stated his proposition in its earlier form for the sake of more elegant Latin.

[5] Endres, *Görresgesellschaft*, xxvi. 169.

Lanfranc also criticised Berengar's quotation from Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, in which Berengar contended that Augustine had stated that the premise 'Not every proposition can stand when part is destroyed' was grounded in truth, which was God. The quotation was not relevant, because Augustine was not treating of this proposition, and Lanfranc properly charges Berengar with wrenching a quotation from its context to support his own case.[2]

Like Durand of Troarn, Lanfranc reverses the symbolism of the Eucharist. The sacrament is called bread by the usage of Holy Scripture by which things are often called by the names of those things by means of which they come into existence.[3] The terms 'species' and 'similitude' are words used of the things which existed before, and from which the body and blood of Christ are prepared.[4] It is usual to give certain things the names of those things from which they are prepared, although being changed into another nature they cannot now be those things by which they are proved effective.[5] The divine pages call the body of the Lord bread, by a sacred or mystical method of speech, either because being prepared from bread it retains some of its qualities, or because it ministers to the soul and substance of eternal life, or because it is the bread of angels.[6] So the consecrated elements are mere symbols of the bread and wine.[1] The Lord Jesus Christ, on account of certain similitudes, is called lamb, worm, tree, rock, corner-stone, and so on.[2] So the body of Christ is called bread since it is made from bread, and since, while it is flesh, it seems to be bread to the eyes which look upon it, or because it is joined by a certain symbolism to corporal visible bread.[3]

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 110 ff. *Cf.* de Ghellinck, *Dialectique et dogme en XI–XII siècles*, p. 87. De Ghellinck thinks this criticism is the best part of Lanfranc's treatise, which is otherwise inferior to that of Alger.

[2] Migne, 150, 418a–b.

[3] *Ibid.* 438a : 'Quod vero panis dicitur, consueto sacrorum codicum more id fit, qui res quaslibet saepe vocant nominibus illarum rerum, ex quibus fiunt. . . .'

[4] *Ibid.* 436b : 'Species namque, et similitudo illarum rerum vocabula sunt, quae ante fuerunt, et ex quibus corpus Christi sanguisque conficitur.'

[5] *Ibid.* 416a : 'Solemus enim aliquas res illarum rerum, ex quibus efficiuntur, nominibus appellare, quamvis, in aliam naturam translatae, jam non possint esse illud quod sunt res illae ex quibus probantur effectae.'

[6] *Ibid.* 416c : ''divina pagina corpus Domini panem vocat, sacrata et mystica locutione id agit, seu quoniam ex pane conficitur,' etc. *Cf.* 438d.

Yet with all this endeavour to deny the reality, by urging that it is only symbolically present, he is compelled to admit that the material bread is actually received in the Eucharist, and nourishes the body, just as the spiritual and invisible body of Christ nourishes the soul.[4] Moreover, he illustrates the true significance of the symbolism by admitting that the Passion is signified by the offering of the priest, not in the actuality of the process, but by a signifying mystery,[5] an argument to which Berengar would have given assent. So Lanfranc's criticism of the Berengarian symbolism not only miscarries by a distorted inversion of eucharistic symbolism, but ends by breaking down. He seems to strive to retain a function for symbolism, an attempt made impossible of fulfilment by his theory of the real presence.

The content of the sacrament is the actual body of Christ.[6] The eucharistic body of Christ did not exist before consecration, but it does exist afterwards.[7] Augustine's statement that the disciples were not about to eat the body of Christ which they saw, nor to drink the blood about to be shed, is to be interpreted in the light of Christ's own words, which testify that He offered to them His very flesh.[8] This flesh is identical with that born of the Virgin, in which He walked on earth.[1] This same body now exists uncontaminated and uncorrupt at the right hand of the Father[2] in heaven, a statement which apparently does not militate against its real presence in the sacrament, nor is the perfect indefectibility of the body of Christ injured by a reception of it.[3]

---

[1] *Supra*, p. 280.

[2] Migne, 150, 438d.

[3] *Ibid.* 438d: 'Sic et corpus Christi vocatur panis, vel quia ex pane conficitur. . . .' On the use of conficere *cf.* 416c, 431a, 436b, etc., but Lanfranc uses this term in a metabolic sense, not as Berengar with the significance of preparing the elements by consecration.

[4] *Ibid.* 438d: 'Nam sicut quia iste materialis panis discrete sumptus humanam carnem nutrit et sustentat, sic spirituale et invisibile corpus Christi animam digne sumentis alit et vegetat.'

[5] *Ibid.* 425a: 'non rei veritate, sed significante mysterio.'

[6] *Ibid.* 423c: 'vero converti in Christi carnem ac sanguinem'; 435c: 'vera Christi caro, verusque ejus sanguis'; 442d: 'Ergo vera est ejus caro, quam accipimus, et verus est ejus sanguis quem potamus.'

[7] *Ibid.* 432a.

[8] *Ibid.* 433d.

But Lanfranc's realism, like his symbolism, breaks down. The sacramental body is the very body which Christ received from the Virgin, and yet it is not the same.[4] 'We do not believe, as some thought,[5] that we eat the body of Christ visibly, or drink the blood which His persecutors were about to pour out before their eyes.'[6] Then how did He offer to His disciples His very flesh? Lanfranc continues: 'Rather do we believe that which we do not see, that faith may exist, for it cannot exist if what is to be believed can be perceived by the corporal senses.'[7] He endeavours to escape from the dilemma by describing both the content and reception of the Eucharist as a mystery.[8] But his attempt at least modifies the crude realism of Humbert's formula, and the complete identification of the eucharistic body with the historical body of Christ in the teaching of Paschasius. Lanfranc began the investigation by which the doctrine of the real presence was rescued from the hands of headstrong zealots. From the beginning, the main body of Catholic doctrine had been expressed in less extravagant terms than those drawn up by Humbert in 1059; but Lanfranc was the first writer to resort to a rational explanation, yet rather in the form of the separation of ideas and the definition of terms than by systematising his conclusions. Hence much had to be done by those who followed him.

The process of his thought is illustrated by his explanation of Transubstantiation. Although he does not altogether exclude the terminology which speaks of a change of substance,[1] he defines the eucharistic change as a change of essence,[2] and by this definition was the first writer to define the sacramental process as one of Transubstantiation.[3] The bread and wine are changed in nature essentially (essentialiter).[4] In their interior nature they are changed into those things which they were not before.[5] They do not remain in their original essence.[6] Quite justifiably he refuses to be limited by the Ambrosian *De Sacramentis*, and quotes also from Ambrose's undoubtedly genuine work *De Mysteriis*, which teaches that if the Word of Christ can create from nothing that which did not previously exist, it can change things which already exist into things which they were not.[7]

---

[1] Migne, 150, 425c, 430c, 433d. Geiselmann, p. 419 n. 1 (quoting Migne, 150, 425a), suggests that the identity was only one of relation. But *cf.* p. 368, 'Der sakramentale Leib ist mit dem historischen identisch in bezug auf Wesen, Natur, Wirkung,' etc.

[2] Migne, 150, 427c, 430c.

[3] *Ibid.* 427c.

[4] *Ibid.* 430c: 'ipsum corpus quod de Virgine sumptum . . . et tamen non ipsum.'

[5] Referring to S. John vi. 52.

[6] Migne, 150, 434a.

[7] *Ibid.* 434a.

[8] *Ibid.* 429a: 'Mysterium namque. . . . Quid enim secretius quam panis vinique speciem conspicere, saporem gustare, tactum sentire?'

His theory of the change is based on the principle that a specific essence cannot be in two things at once. 'What sane person believes that a thing can be changed into something else without ceasing to be what it was?' He was the first among the metabolists to ground the conception of the real presence, not in the creation of a new principle of action in the elements, but in that of a new principle of being, which is communicated to the recipient under the covering of the qualities of bread and wine, which remain objectively in the sacrament, not merely subjectively to the perception of the recipient.[8] But he does not advance to a statement of the theory of accidence and substance.[9] Yet just as he was not quite sure of his theory when criticising the Berengarian symbolism, and when grounding his own idea of the inward reality of the sacramental content, so for a third time his conception breaks down when he admits, on the one hand, that the essence into which the essence of bread and wine is changed is super-substantial,[1] and on the other, when he speaks of a material change.[2] If the change is material there must be a complete obliteration of qualities as well as of nature and essence. Moreover, the two statements are contradictory.

---

[1] Migne, 150, 430b f.: 'terrenas substantias . . . converti in essentiam Dominici corporis.'

[2] *Ibid.* 417b: 'essentialiter mutari' (criticising the contrary statement of Berengar).

[3] *Cf.* Geiselmann, p. 374.

[4] Migne, 150, 427a: 'essentialiter mutata natura.'

[5] *Ibid.* 420d: 'secundum interiorem essentiam in naturam illarum rerum, quae antea non erant.'

[6] *Ibid.* 415b: 'in pristinis essentiis' (criticising Berengar's contrary statement).

[7] *Ibid.* 421a.

[8] Geiselmann, p. 369. Schnitzer, p. 349, thinks that Lanfranc's teaching does not represent an advance on that of his predecessors.

[9] *Cf.* Geiselmann, pp. 372, 374.

Lanfranc attempts to overcome the antinomy in his system by representing the sacramental union as a clothing of the body and blood of Christ with the visible form of bread and wine.[3] Some qualities of the bread and wine are retained,[4] such as appearance and certain other qualities,[5] doubtless with reference to flavour and smell. So he limits the application of the terms ' species ' and ' similitude ' to those qualities of the elements which they possessed before the sacramental change took place.[6] The sacrifice of the Church consists of two things: the visible form of the elements and the invisible flesh and blood of the Lord Jesus, so there is the sacrament and the ' thing of the sacrament,' [7] an Augustinian statement. It is the very body received from the Virgin in essence and nature and effectiveness, but it is not the same in appearance (species).[8]

The term 'sacrament' in Holy Scripture is not limited to one usage.[9] But it is not to be interpreted by the significance which it has in common usage, as when we speak of an oath as a sacrament, or as the consecration of anything.[10] In the invisible, noumenal, and spiritual flesh and blood the body of the Redeemer is signified visibly, palpably, clearly.[11] But as Lanfranc has denied a material essence to the bread and wine, the conclusion again contradicts itself, save on the artificial assumption that the qualities of bread and wine are perceptible to touch, taste, and smell, and can be separated from their inward essence.

Lanfranc maintains that the Augustinian distinction between the sacrament and the thing of the sacrament supports his case, rather than that of Berengar,[1] and yet offers the quibbling objection that Berengar cannot appeal to Augustine in support of his definition of a sacrament as a sign, for in the passage quoted by Berengar from the *De Civitate Dei* Augustine was not discussing the Eucharist;[2] and, on the contrary, he admits Berengar's argument, drawn from Augustine, that the sacraments bear the similitude of that which they signify,[3] but in an entirely different sense. By feigning to continue His journey beyond the village of Emmaus, the Lord signified to the two disciples His Ascension, so therefore Christ is a sacrament of Christ; but He is Christ in either case,[4] thus His flesh and blood are sacraments of themselves.[5] Baptism is the sacrament of faith, but an actual washing away of sin takes place.[6] Moreover the Ambrosian statement, 'I see a similitude, I do not see actual blood,' refers to the form of the bread and wine beneath which the nature of the body of Christ is covered.[7]

---

[1] Migne, 150, 419a : ' supersubstantialem.'

[2] *Ibid.* 415b : ' materiali mutatione ' (criticising Berengar's statement to the contrary).

[3] *Ibid.* 420d : ' Esse quidem secundum visibilem speciem testatur quae erant ' ; *cf.* 422c.

[4] *Ibid.* 416c : ' ex pane . . . nonnullas retinet qualitates.'

[5] *Ibid.* 150, 430c : ' reservatis ipsarum rerum specibus et quibusdam aliis qualitatibus.'

[6] *Ibid.* 436b ; *cf.* 423c.

[7] *Ibid.* 421b–c.

[8] *Ibid.* 430c.

[9] *Ibid.* 437d.

[10] *Ibid.* 423b.

[11] *Ibid.* 424a.

Lanfranc's theory of Transubstantiation consists of two parts which are not adequately welded together, and nowhere else does this defect appear so prominently. It occurs again in the distinction which he draws between the two aspects of reception. Augustine contrasted eating with the body and eating with the heart;[8] between physical and spiritual feeding. We feed physically when we receive the body and blood from the hand of the priest.[9] We feed spiritually when we remember that Christ took flesh for the salvation of the world, and when His commands are obeyed and brotherly charity is valued for the love of Christ.[10] In spiritual feeding we receive the whole Christ,[11] whereas in corporal feeding we receive only the sacramental body and blood,[12] and both modes of reception are necessary.[1] Now spiritual feeding was explained by Augustine as a recognition of the body of Christ, which the faithful become, if they live by His Spirit.[2] But Lanfranc makes use of Augustine's sacramentalism,[3] which centres in worthy reception, in order to support his own realism which is concerned with the sacramental content. Not how one receives, but what is received, is Lanfranc's idea.[4] None the less, by directing the attention of orthodox teachers to the Augustinian distinction between the sacrament and the thing of the sacrament, Lanfranc diverted them from the cruder realism of Radbert, a recovery from which later writers have never allowed themselves to decline.[5]

---

[1] Migne, 150, 423c. [2] *Ibid.* 422c. [3] *Ibid.* 423a, 424b, 437c.

[4] *Ibid.* 424c (quoting Augustine).

[5] *Ibid.* 424b: 'eadem caro idemque sanguis sui ipsorum sacramenta existant secundum aliud atque aliud accepta.' The theory of identity could hardly be more plainly expressed.

[6] *Ibid.* 424d, 425a.

[7] *Ibid.* 437a: 'sub qua corporis Christi natura contegitur.'

[8] *Ibid.* 429b.

[9] *Ibid.* 429b. [10] *Ibid.* 425c.

[11] *Ibid.* 425c: 'totus Christus manducari.'

[12] *Ibid.* 425c: 'Sumitur quidem caro per se et sanguis per se non sine certi mysterii ratione.'

[1] Migne, 150, 425c–d.

[2] *Ibid.* 429d–430a.

[3] Cf. *In Joan.*, Tr., xxvi.

[4] Geiselmann, p. 373 f.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 375.

CHAPTER XVI

BERENGAR ‘ON THE HOLY SUPPER’

In his own day Berengar was a defeated man, but no career illustrates more completely the wisdom of never admitting defeat. From this unconquerable attitude sprang the *De Sacra Cœna*, which has enabled a later generation to rescue the teaching of that persevering controversialist from the hands of his enemies, and from the gossiping letter-writers of his own age. If the campaign for a plain and sensible interpretation of the words of Scripture and sayings of the Fathers was lost by Berengar in the eleventh century, when the realists passed over him in their advance to final victory in 1215, the date when Transubstantiation became the official dogma of the Church, yet by handing on the *De Sacra Cœna* Berengar has shown how well developed the evangelical theory of the Eucharist was in the early Middle Ages.

But if the contents of his book have placed succeeding generations under an obligation of gratitude to him, its form constitutes for all who read it a labour and a penance. As a disquisition it is amorphous, as a composition it entirely lacks the qualities of the beautiful epistle to the hermits. The elliptical and frequently almost untranslatable syntax, the disorderly treatment of topic after topic, pursuing no sequence of ideas, and guided by fits and starts of emotional recollection rather than by methodical thought—the mind occupied for a few moments with a subject springing forth from the welter of badly correlated notions which crowded his brain, then seizing upon another—the book will always be a cause of despair, save to the most patient of readers. Being agitated, his Latin style became disorganised. Perhaps his most trying trick is the constant use of the double negative. Often he appears to have been thinking in his mother-tongue, and writing in Latin, without taking care to translate his syntax as well as his accidence. Again, the constant repetition of statement and quotation, the doubling back upon themes already worn threadbare, suggest not only excessive excitement of brain, but a composition put together at intervals during a period of persecution when the writer was never sure of an opportunity for protracted work. He seems to have forgotten what had already been written, and the book is the output of a mind which did not naturally unburden itself, or discharge at leisure the ideas which it struggled to throw out. He wrote in haste and fear lest destruction should overtake him before his great apologia was completed. It is even possible that the only MS. which exists is his own unrevised and uncorrected copy. As a polemical work it was written with one eye upon the adversary. It rebuts, point after point, the shafts of the enemy, and this constitutes the only method of composition observed by its writer. That Berengar intended his work to go forth to the world in its present form is inconceivable. If he had been allowed opportunity for leisurely composition he might have produced a classic work on the doctrine of the Eucharist, for if amorphous and unmethodical, the *De Sacra Cœna* is its own trumpeter, and contains in its uncorrelated paragraphs ideas and explanations which in themselves are quite clear. The process of drawing them forth and setting them in as orderly a sequence as may be amounts almost to editorial revision.

However defective Berengar's earlier studies of Holy Scripture on the doctrine of the Eucharist may have been, this omission was amply filled by the time the *De Sacra Cœna* was written. It abounds with references both to the Old and New Testaments. Whoever goes contrary, he says, to the gospels and epistles, and indeed to any of the 'authentic Scriptures,' does not do well.[1] The weight of authority of the prophetical books,[2] the gospels and epistles is not to be refused.[3] The Holy Spirit speaks in the Scriptures.[4] He denies that he has thrown aside the Scriptures,[5] and he

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 57.

[2] He means O.T. generally.

[3] *D.S.C.* p. 245.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 161.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 100.

recommends Lanfranc to a closer study of them,[1] especially of the saying 'Ye err, not knowing the Scriptures.'[2]

But Berengar does not interpret this evangelical maxim in any narrow or legalist sense.[3] He quotes a passage from Origen, which he attributes to Jerome,[4] saying that the letter of the New Testament, as well as that of the Old Testament, killeth unless a man reads spiritually. So, the words in S. John vi., 'Unless ye eat my flesh and drink my blood,' and in S. Luke xxii. 36, 'He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one,' if taken literally, are letters which kill.[5] He denies that the words in S. John vi. 58, 'He who eateth me, liveth on account of me,' have any reference to the sacrament of the altar.[6] If the laws promulgated by God for men are to be interpreted as the Jews interpreted them, or as they were commonly interpreted in his day, then 'I blush to own that such laws were given by God,' and the laws of men, for example, of the Romans, Athenians, and Lacedaemonians, will seem more elegant and rational.[7]

Following in the steps of John the Scot,[8] he mentions that the Scriptures are to be interpreted by the aid of reason.[9] It is incomparably better to make use of reason than merely to quote sacred writings in ascertaining truth.[10] Augustine says that authority (the appeal to tradition) cannot, humanly speaking, take precedence over the reason of pure mind, which reaches clear truth. Human stupidity ought to be ashamed when it turns to authority for the corroboration of truth, when nothing can excel the authority of truth.[11] The rational creature within us aspires, through grace, to union with Christ.[12] But if, according to Berengar's statement, the pure reason apprehends truth, this is not mere intuition, for the exercise of the reason necessitates not merely the exercise of the rational faculties or common sense, but the use of formal logic, or dialectics.[1] It is the function of a strong spirit in all matters to take refuge in dialectics, for this is equivalent to taking refuge in reason, and he who does not take refuge in it surrenders his honour, and cannot be renewed from day to day in the image of God. Augustine said that dialectics is the art of arts, the discipline of disciplines. It can learn; it can teach; it not only desires to create people who know, but does it.[2] A man of spirit would rather prefer to perish, if he had the option, than to yield to tradition.[3]

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 234. [2] *Ibid.* p. 71.

[3] Ébersolt, p. 164 (*cf.* p. 174), thinks that he sets up the authority of Scripture as a new principle against the idea of the authority of the Church. *Cf.* Faivre, p. 27.

[4] *Cf.* Rückert, *Das Abendmahl . . . in der alten Kirche*, p. 345 n.

[5] *D.S.C.*, p. 270 f. [6] *Ibid.* p. 236. [7] *Ibid.* p. 271.

[8] *De Div. Nat.*, iii. 5, 26, 30, 38, etc. *Cf.* Endres, *Görresgesellschaft Phil. Jahrbuch*, xix. 26, xxvi. 166.

[9] *D.S.C.*, pp. 182, 190 : 'solo intellectu.'

[10] *Ibid.* p. 100 : 'ubi deducendi sacras auctoritates in medium necessitate inde agendi locus occurrerit, quamquam ratione agere in perceptione veritatis incomparabiliter superius esse.'

[11] *Ibid.* p. 100, quoting *De Vera Religione* (*cf.* cap. xxxvi., Migne 34, 151). [12] *D.S.C.*, p. 226.

At the same time Berengar maintains that Lanfranc has exaggerated his use of dialectics. To make use of dialectical terminology for the explanation of truth was not to take refuge in dialectics as a final court of appeal.[4] Christ Himself did not refuse to make use of this method when He said 'If I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your sons cast them out?' and 'If David in the Spirit called Him Lord, how is He his Son?'[5] Reason is predominant and independent of the authority of tradition.[1] Yet, as Harnack has said, in opposition to Reuter, Berengar did not set up the 'criticism of negative illuminism' against authority, but in order that authority, or the true tradition of the Church, might be delivered from the embrace of a bad routine.[2]

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 101. On Berengar's use of dialectics *cf.* especially Endres, *Görresgesellschaft Phil. Jahrbuch*, xix. 21 ff., xxvi. 160 ff.

[2] *D.S.C.*, p. 101. In a marginal note on the same page (101) occurs a statement that divine things are not only to be believed, but are to be thought out rationally, and so retained. On the next page (102) another marginal note appears, dealing with a statement of Lanfranc condemning the use of dialectics. The writer then asks how dialectics can be used in the treatment of Holy Scripture. For example, if the Son of Man was three days and three nights in the tomb, He rose on the fourth day. The difficulty cannot be explained away as a synecdoche, as some say, for the Lord says expressly not merely three days, which would have been sufficient, but also three nights. Cannot a dialectical proposition be made of this, for example: 'An affirmation is a statement about something, a negation is a statement (derogating) from something'? If these notes are Berengar's, they support the suggestion that the MS. is his original copy. On p. 102 n. 1 the writer certainly quotes Lanfranc 'dialecticas quaestiones, vel earum solutiones' (Migne, 150, 417a).

[3] *D.S.C.*, p. 102. Faivre, p. 37, thinks that Berengar's method brings scepticism to the door. Absolute truth cannot be apprehended even by reason. Because the facts on which faith rests cannot be rendered intelligible, both fact and dogma are rejected. But the criticism of Faivre points to the end of inquiry and issues in obscurantism.

[4] *D.S.C.*, p. 101. Here, again, is a marginal note (1) saying that the writer was not ashamed of taking refuge in dialectics, if he had really done so.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 101.

Berengar's criticism of the theory of Paschasius, Humbert, and Lanfranc strikes at the root of all realist interpretations of the Eucharist. He refuses to admit their denial that the material elements remain on the altar after consecration,[3] and he denies their assertion that the real substantial body and blood of Christ are present after consecration.[4] His criticism therefore advances along two avenues. Paschasius and Lanfranc urged that although the substances of bread and wine do not remain on the altar after consecration in their original elements,[5] yet they are present in their visible form[6] and retain the colour of bread and wine.[7] Berengar replies that the qualities of colour, flavour, and smell cannot be separated from their substances.[8] If the original elements or substances disappear, the qualities which the senses apprehend cannot remain. It is as absurd to maintain that the substance of bread can be changed into the substance of the body of Christ and yet retain the colour of bread, as it would be to allege, on the contrary, that by changing the colour of a man's face into that of an Ethiopian's the substance of his face could be changed.[9] By the evidence of the senses the colour of the elements remains,[10] and they themselves can be seen.[11] We have, in addition, the evidence of the words of institution and of the Fathers. At the Supper Christ broke material bread and spoke of material bread. When He used the words 'Eat of *this*,'

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 53. Schnitzer, p. 267 f. (quoting *D.S.C.*, p. 214 : 'Si non sufficis quod dico, . . . ratione comprehendere, cede auctoritati meae'; p. 215 : 'cede auctoritati, si ad rationem non sufficis'; p. 230 : 'oportet ergo te hoc fide tenere, si ratiocinari non sufficis'), states that Berengar allowed precedence to authority when reason could not succeed in arriving at truth. But it is to be observed that this is Berengar's comment on an Ambrosian passage.

[2] *Hist. of Dogma*, vi. 46, criticising Reuter, i. 97.

[3] *D.S.C.*, pp. 31, 33, 70, 81, 84, 97, 105 ff., 122, 128, 156, 177, 180.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 65.

[5] *Ibid.* pp. 139, 140, 156, 160, 212.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 45 : 'visibilem speciem, non ipsum subjectum.' *Cf.* p. 138. Berengar uses 'subjectum' for 'substantia' in most passages.

[7] *Ibid.* pp. 45, 127, 192, 194, 202, 245.

[8] *Ibid.* pp. 171, 227.

[9] *Ibid.* p. 127.

[10] *Ibid.* p. 171.

[11] *Ibid.* p. 135.

He referred to 'this *thing*.'[1] If nothing remains on the altar, after consecration, save flesh, then Christ did not speak the truth.[2] Even Ambrose admits that what is seen is corporal,[3] and Augustine spoke of actual bread which the eyes can see.[4] The words of the Canon of the Mass do not entail a destruction of the elements of bread and wine,[5] and whatever the effect of consecration may be, it does not annihilate or destroy the natural substance of bread and wine.[6] The result of Lanfranc's theory is to reverse the usage of symbolism by diverting it from the body and blood of Christ to the bread and wine. On his assumption the bread is merely symbolical or tropical, and the Eucharist symbolises not the body of Christ, but the bread which existed before consecration.[7] Yet the bread is present not symbolically but actually [8] in its ordinary material or substance.[9] It comes from the field into the granary, from the granary to the mill, from the mill on to the Lord's Table.[10] Its nature is preserved, and it can be broken with the hands and ground with the teeth.[11] So Lanfranc cannot in any way deny the existence of bread and wine in the sacrament.[12] To hold them in contempt is to be guilty of the sin of Naaman, who despised the waters of Jordan,[13] and to deny their existence after consecration is equivalent to denying that Melchizedek offered bread and wine to Abraham,[14] although there is no real comparison between the offering of the Canon of the Mass and the sacrifices of Abel, Abraham, and Melchizedek, for one is incomparably higher and the others are incomparably lower.[15]

In his previous treatise Berengar had alleged that although Humbert was an enemy to truth, none the less was he a supporter of truth, a statement which Lanfranc had criticised on the general ground that no one could at once oppose and yet support truth. Berengar now explains at length the meaning of his remark. Although Humbert denied, and had compelled Berengar to deny, in the terms of the oath of 1059, that bread and wine remained on the altar after consecration, yet in whatever formula Humbert stated his positive belief he could not escape from an admission of the existence of bread and wine in the Eucharist. Whether he affirmed that the bread and wine which are placed on the altar are, after consecration, sacraments ; or the bread and wine which are placed on the altar are, after consecration, true body and blood of Christ ; or, again, the bread and wine which are placed on the altar are, after consecration, *only* true body and blood of Christ—in each case, Berengar contends, Humbert has admitted the survival of the bread and wine.[1]

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 85: 'haec res.' *Cf.* p. 234.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 279.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 205.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 192.

[5] *Ibid.* pp. 277 f., 285 f.

[6] *Ibid.* pp. 68 f., 70, 81, 116, 122 f., 129, 143, 146, 161 ff., 170, 186, 191, 194, 209, 212, 230.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 138: 'secundum figmentum tuum tropica locutione panem et vinum diceres appellari.' *Cf.* pp. 139, 140, 173, 233, 253, 259.

[8] *Ibid.* pp. 69, 75, 81, 85, etc.

[9] *Ibid.* pp. 139, 164, 173, 205, 216, 232.

[10] *Ibid.* p. 215. Guitmund (Hurter, xxxviii. 74) alleged that Berengar had said that Christ's body was never sown as seed and harvested from the fields, but the eucharistic elements were. How can they therefore be the body of Christ?

[11] *D.S.C.*, p. 119.

[12] *Ibid.* p. 243.

[13] *Ibid.* pp. 126, 132, 168, 172, 204 f.

[14] *Ibid.* pp. 129 f., 135 ff., 139, 147, etc.

[15] *Ibid.* p. 281.

The proposition must stand as a whole in its subjective and predicative terms. Humbert sets up as a subjective statement 'the bread and wine which are placed on the altar,' together with its predicate, 'are true body and blood of Christ' or 'only true body and blood of Christ.' If, then, he afterwards denies either term he overthrows his own case.[2] In the earlier treatise Berengar had driven home this argument by affirming that not every proposition could stand if part of it were overthrown, and Lanfranc had succeeded in destroying his case by pointing out that this was a particular, not a general, premise, so that his conclusion was invalid.[3] Berengar rather lamely now tried to cover himself by alleging that a similar usage of the words 'not every' was to be found in the Vulgate.[4] Yet the quotations which he offered are not convincing, and he admitted that he had stated the syllogism badly, but claimed that the substance of his argument remained intact and that

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 107 f. : 'neque dubitet tamen ille ipse affirmare, panem et vinum superesse in altari . . . panis et vinum, quae ponuntur in altari, sunt post consecrationem sacramenta, vel : panis et vinum, quae ponuntur in altari, sunt post consecrationem verum Christi corpus et sanguis, vel etiam ita : panis et vinum, quae ponuntur in altari sunt post consecrationem solummodo verum Christi corpus et sanguis. . . .' *Cf.* pp. 30 f., 85.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 108 ; *cf.* pp. 88, 117.

[3] *Supra*, p. 291 ff.

[4] *D.S.C.*, p. 110.

Lanfranc had not attempted to deal with it.[1] However, he was careful to adopt the general premise recommended by Lanfranc, and to state his argument so—'Every proposition falls if part is overthrown,'[2] and conceded that if his premise were destroyed his conclusion went with it. But he who admits the whole of this proposition necessarily admits the part, whether the subjective or predicative term. Berengar had appealed to Augustine, who in the work 'On Christian Doctrine' had used his original premise 'Not every statement can stand when part is overthrown,' and had avowed that it was grounded in truth itself which is God. Lanfranc had refused to allow the relevancy of Augustine's remark because Berengar had taken it from its proper context, but Berengar claims that Lanfranc's objection, while true de facto, was inadmissible, because he (Berengar) could make use of Augustine's statement as part of the riches which, the Scriptures said, God gives to all.[3]

Berengar's conclusion had already been strengthened by the argument that whenever, in a proposition, the predicate is related to something which is not predicable in fact, it is a tropical or symbolical form of speech. In the statements Christ is a lion, a lamb, the chief corner-stone, the predicate is a figure of speech. So also the apostolic statement 'That rock was Christ' does not predicate the divine man. In the statement 'the bread is the body of Christ' there is a literal and a figurative term,[4] and the subject cannot be regarded as having become non-existent.[5]

Lanfranc had also questioned his use of the word 'only' (solummodo) in the twofold proposition which Berengar had offered to Humbert.[1] If Berengar affirmed that the bread and wine were only sacraments, this was a denial of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist.[2] Berengar replies that 'solummodo' is a mere conjunctive, although it was made necessary by the opinion of Humbert.[3] Moreover, it is impossible for anything which is a sacrament to be 'only,' without implying the existence of that to which the sacrament refers—'the thing of the sacrament.'[4]

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 110: 'maxime, quoquo dixissem modo, reprehendendus fui'; p. 111: 'Quod male syllogismum collocaverim, mores facis, circa rem ipsam nec transeuntes agis.'

[2] *Ibid.* p. 111: 'Omnis affirmatio non constabit parte subruta.' *Cf.* p. 234, where the positive nature of the affirmation is more strongly expressed: 'omnis enuntiatio amissa parte altera utra, praedicatum dico atque subjectum, constare non poterit.'

[3] *Ibid.* p. 111.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 83.

[5] *Cf.* Harnack, vi. 48: 'Dialectics, the science which always differentiates, is nowhere more in its proper place than when there is a question about two objects, which in one respect are one, and in another respect different. Thus the two-nature doctrine is very peculiarly its province; so also is the doctrine of the Eucharist, with its earthly elements and heavenly gift.'

This criticism of the realist negative statement of the content of the Eucharist is balanced by an equally trenchant refutation of its positive side. Whatever explanation they may offer, their terminology described an actual material body of Christ upon the altar,[5] identical with the flesh and blood received from the Virgin Mary, and consisting of the very mass of the body of Christ,[6] as Paschasius, he alleges, taught. At Vercelli it was maintained that the breaking of the body with the hands, and grinding with the teeth, referred not to the sacrament, but to its content.[7] His opponents alleged that the body of Christ was corruptible,[8] that it came down from heaven,[9] and was present on the altar as a little portion (portiuncula) of flesh[10] and blood.[11] This terminology recalls some of the language if not the teaching of Gregory of Nyssa and Chrysostom and the sensual stories of miraculous manifestations of the body of Christ which were current in the West from the days of Gregory the Great.

Berengar continues with his relentless criticism of the physical implications involved in the material-realist phraseology and points out that they end in contradiction and even absurdity. In the earlier part of his treatise Lanfranc had asserted that material bread did not survive on the altar, but a small portion of flesh, made from bread, and described the colour or visible appearance of this little portion of flesh—not the substance, but of that which was attached to the substance—as the sacrament.[1] Berengar appears to refer to Lanfranc's use of the old Gallic idea of a symbolism of the bread, not of the body (which was the real essential content) in the sacrament.[2] But, urges Berengar, Lanfranc in a later part of his book states that the sacrament is not the colour or form of the little portion of flesh, but the little portion itself, *i.e.* not that which is attached to the substance, but the very substance of the whole body of Christ, which is in heaven.[3] Lanfranc, of course, had not made this subtle distinction between the sacrament and its spiritual content, and if Berengar justly exposes the wavering character of his thought, yet he does less than justice to Lanfranc's terminology. Lanfranc really gave expression to a view which was soon to become general among orthodox writers—namely, that the whole body of Christ was present in the Eucharist—but at times he made use of physical terms, inspired by Paschasius, which described the content of the sacrament as a little portion of the flesh of Christ[4] (without using Berengar's term 'portiuncula'), and Berengar unfairly treats this section of the teaching of Lanfranc and Paschasius when that is regarded as a whole.

---

[1] Migne, 150, 415a. [2] *Ibid.* 418d. [3] *D.S.C.*, p. 106.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 114; *cf.* pp. 66, 121 f. Is Endres (p. 127) justified in regarding Berengar's explanation as sophistical, and does Geiselmann (p. 366) accurately represent Lanfranc's estimate of Berengar's use of 'solummodo'? On the latter question, Geiselmann should be compared with Endres' criticism of Prantl, but the terminology of both Berengar and Lanfranc is obscure.

[5] *D.S.C.*, p. 182: 'tu dicis, carnem esse sensualiter in altari.' *Cf.* pp. 85 f., 197, 200.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 281: 'in ipsam Christi corporis massam.'

[7] *Ibid.* p. 45. [8] *Ibid.* p. 32. [9] *Ibid.* p. 117.

[10] *Ibid.* pp. 45, 109, 119, 127, 140, 168, 189, 194, 197, 203, 242.

[11] *Ibid.* pp. 119, 134, 174 f., 203. *Cf.* pp. 140 ff., 161.

He is on firmer ground when he alleges that Lanfranc cannot decide what he means by the term 'flesh of Christ,' and ends by postulating two fleshes of Christ, for while he contends that a little portion is made on the altar by consecration, he does not deny that the body of Christ has existed since the Resurrection incorruptibly. That which has existed for a thousand years cannot come into existence for the first time on the altar unless the body of Christ is cut up in heaven and the portions are placed on the altar.[5]

The contradiction in Lanfranc's system appears again, for while his assertion that the eucharistic body can be touched and broken amounts to an admission that it is corruptible, yet,

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 45. *Cf.* Migne, 150, 420d, 421b. [2] *D.S.C.*, p. 244.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 45, 182. *Cf.* Migne, 150, 430c, 425c.

[4] *Cf.* Migne, 150, 421c: 'carnes ejus sint comestae' (quoting S. Andrew).

[5] *D.S.C.*, pp. 200, 203, 244.

'by a wonderful stupidity,' he does not hesitate to call it invisible and noumenal [1] (intelligibilem). Moreover, the implications of Berengar's adversaries lead on to other absurdities. If the body of Christ were actually present on the altar, there would be in existence, every day and at the same time, a million bodies of Christ.[2] But Christ was sacrificed once only, and we offer a memorial of that sacrifice,[3] and if the whole body of Christ is on the altar, only one priest could offer the sacrifice of Christ.[4] The body of Christ cannot be cut up into sections.[5] If Christ's body had been as big as a tower [6] or mountain,[7] it would long ago have been exhausted if submitted to the sacramental process of realism. From another point of view the argument leads to the conclusion that the body of Christ would not be in existence at all until after consecration had taken place.[8]

Berengar uses the ruthless language of a modern materialist [9] in exposing physical absurdities which certainly existed in the conceptions of his opponents. Yet Paschasius [10] and Lanfranc [11] both deny a physical eating in the Eucharist, and we have seen that the latter admitted that the body of Christ remained whole in heaven. The writers of the day perhaps justly accused Berengar of using stercoristan or crudely physical language in his strictures. But although the ruthlessness of his phraseology may be condemned, the content of his criticism was legitimate, for it points to contradictions in orthodox thought which actually existed, and Dr. Gore concludes that his 'logic is, if pitiless, morally justifiable and successful.' [12] The mistake made by his adversaries lay in the attempt to find an actual, real, and substantial equivalent for the symbolical terms 'body' and 'blood.' The effect of this teaching, while placing the body and blood of Christ on the Lord's Table, is to remove the sacraments of the body and blood.[1] Lanfranc's realism ends in a denial of sacramentalism.

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 200 f. [2] *Ibid.* p. 198. [3] *Ibid.* pp. 131, 272 f.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 199. [5] *Ibid.* pp. 131, 149, 237, 244.

[6] Peter the Venerable (Migne, 189, 799d) reports that he heard Berengar make this statement.

[7] Guitmund (Hurter, xxxviii. 65). [8] *D.S.C.*, p. 203.

[9] Yet Berengar was far from being a mere materialist. *Cf.* Endres, *Görresgesellschaft Phil. Jahrbuch*, xxvi. 166.

[10] Migne, 120, 1280c.

[11] *Ibid.* 150, 434b, 438d, etc. *Cf.* Berengar, *D.S.C.*, pp. 236, 256, 262, where the reception is described as incorporeal, criticising Lanfranc's reference to grinding with the teeth.

[12] *Dissertations*, p. 254.

Does Berengar deny the doctrine of the real presence of the body of Christ in the Eucharist? Different answers to this question have been given since the days of Mabillon. Mabillon contended that while denying Transubstantiation, Berengar did not deny the real presence, and many other Roman Catholic writers take the same view.[2] Geiselmann, who has supplied us with the best critical examination of his teaching so far published, denies that he believed in the real presence.[3] An attempt must be made to ascertain what Berengar himself says.

A beginning may be made with his statement that the body of Christ cannot be recalled from heaven before the final consummation of all things.[4] Since the Resurrection it is a visible and palpable body [5]—a view which Ratramn had expressed [6]—but it cannot be extended in space, and still less can it suffer dissolution.[7] If one speaks of honouring the Pope by clothing, feeding, or bathing his Cardinal, or conversely by ill-treating the Cardinal, one does not imply that the Pope has left Rome and is really present. So we can only speak of a sacramental breaking of the body of Christ, which actually remains in heaven,[8] and is a super-substantial body.[9] Thus, it cannot begin to exist at consecration.[10] It is neither visibly on the altar[1] nor materially present.[2] Therefore he denies the conception, which had been current since the days of the Greek Fathers, of an identity between the eucharistic content and the Resurrection body of Christ, just as he denies an identity between the eucharistic body and the flesh which Christ received from the Virgin Mary.[3] In no sense can the term 'body of the Lord' be used of the Eucharist save sacramentally, as S. Paul and S. Augustine taught.[4]

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 81.

[2] Schnitzer, p. 303 ff., gives a list of the writers on both sides. *Cf. supra*, p. 210 ff.

[3] P. 359. It is to be regretted that Rückert did not complete the work begun in the *Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftlich Theologie* (1858) by carrying his penetrating study of medieval eucharistic doctrine down to Berengar's era. This was his original intention. If Geiselmann surpasses Rückert in the analysis of ideas, Rückert's analysis of terms is more complete. Schnitzer's account is weakened by his method. He examines the teaching of Berengar, his Biblical proofs, and then his patristic proofs, and is compelled to resort to more repetition than is necessary. The best French account is that of Ébersolt.

[4] *D.S.C.*, pp. 94 ff., 148, 156 ff., 196 ff.

[5] *Ibid.* pp. 195, 200, 247.

[6] Migne, 121, 165b.

[7] *D.S.C.*, pp. 94 f., 148 f., 200 f.

[8] *Ibid.* p. 273.

[9] *Ibid.* p. 119 f.

[10] *Ibid.* pp. 94 ff., 148 f., etc. Durand (Migne, 149, 1387b) wrongly attributed to Berengar's followers the idea that the eucharistic body was newly created at each consecration. This was a view which sprang from Paschasius (*supra*, pp. 235, 237).

In the eleventh and twelfth centuries the word 'sacrament' became more and more associated with the idea of 'symbol,' or 'figure,' a usage which had been fostered in the Carolingian era.[5]

This raises the question of Berengar's theory of the sacrament. He bases his definition upon an argument which has led several writers to conclude that one of the sources of Nominalism is to be traced in his system.[6] He says that a moderately learned man knows that terms like sacrament, food, element, raiment, ornament are not particulars (solitaria). Particulars are the names of specific objects which are differentiated from other things—such as earth or bread—which have no reference to anything save themselves, and cannot be extended so as to comprise many other things, unless, for example, the term 'earth' is equated with 'element,' when it can be applied to earth, water, etc., or when bread is used in the sense of food. 'Element' and 'food' are general terms—so also is the term 'sacrament'—which, while connoting to the mind a certain thing possessing a special name, yet imparts to the recipient something which is common or general with other things.[1]

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, pp. 157, 190, 196, 224.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 138, 194, 204, 247, 276, 289.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 83–87, 91, 127 ff.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 89; *cf.* p. 113.

[5] De Ghellinck, *Pour l'Histoire du mot 'Sacrament,'* i. (Spic. sac. Lovaniense, fasc. 3), 1924, 18 f.

[6] *Cf.* Hauréau, i. 230 ff.; von Prantl, ii. 73 f.; Ritter (*Gesch. der Christl. Philos.*, iii. 308); Höfler, ii. 86 n. 24; Dieckhoff, p. 56; Harnack, vi. 49; Schnitzer, p. 306 ff.; Bach, i. 372, 376, 379, 381. But Bach agrees that his theory of essence was not identical with that of Aristotle (*infra*, p. 316). The question is still under discussion. Ébersolt, pp. 173–179, denies that Nominalism can be found in Berengar's teaching. His system was simply 'rational.' Endres adopts the same view, *Görresgesellschaft Phil. Jahrbuch*, xix. 21 ff., xxvi. 160 ff. (Endres has a useful summary of the conflicting interpretations of Berengar's rationalism.) He shows (p. 163 n. 5) that Prantl's proof (*Gesch. der Logik*, ii. 75 n. 306) for Berengar's Nominalism (*D.S.C.*, p. 66: 'elementum ad plura itur, nisi, unde agas, de tena,' etc.) indicates the opposite. Yet Geyer, *Die Pat. und Scol. Phil.* (1928), p. 186, repeats the older view, following Grabmann (1909), i. 219 ff. W. H. V. Reade (*Camb. Med. Hist.*, v.) says that Nominalism was 'an intellectual firework of the age of Roscelin and Abelard' (p. 795), and holds that it is wrong to equate it with conceptualism (p. 796); it is even doubtful whether Nominalism is the right name for the doctrine propounded by Roscelin. On p. 791 Reade refers to 'the huge disturbance created by Berengar's *De Cœna Domini*' [*sic*]. But Berengar's book was unknown in his own day and for long afterwards. J. Reiners, *Der Nominalismus in der Frühscholastik* (*Beiträge*, viii. 1910), also holds that Berengar had nothing to do with Nominalism, beyond showing a 'sensualismus' which is a sign of a defective philosophical education (p. 9). Nor was Roscelin a Nominalist; he shared the ideas of Boethius; there is only a bare analogy with Nominalism in his teaching, which is rather empirical than rationalistic (p. 41). We have Nominalism for the first time in Abelard's system (pp. 41–59).

There is indeed a nominalistic ring in this phraseology, but when Berengar's developed theory of the sacrament is examined a vague Platonic realism appears to lie behind his thoughts. He quotes Augustine's letter to Faustus, in which the former refers to a 'mystical becoming' at consecration, not a creative action,[2] and Berengar conceives of the body of Christ as *existing* in idea, in heaven, on the Platonic theory. This body *becomes* effective and so available for men in its sacramental counterpart or type. The consecrated eucharistic elements have the value of the body of Christ for the salvation of the soul.[3] It is their function to concentrate attention upon the body of Christ, which cannot be touched with the hands, since it remains in heaven.[4] This approximation to Platonic idealism [5] is the nearest approach made by Berengar to sacramental realism, and embodies a realism of a more refined character than that conceived by Lanfranc and other contemporaries on the orthodox side. Even the resurrected flesh of Christ which sits at the right hand of the Father is supersubstantial, as Ambrose and Augustine said.[6]

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 66 f.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 67: 'panis et vinum non quaelibet certa consecratione mystica non nascuntur nobis, sed fiunt.'

[3] *Ibid.* p. 84: 'ut digne sumptus valeret ad animae salutem.' *Cf.* p. 285.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 284: 'quia constitutum in coelo usque in tempora restitutionis omnium, inconfractum, inabsumptum ignibus, inattritum dentibus, quia impassibile permanet Christi corpus.'

[5] Ébersolt, p. 172 f., traces the Neo-Platonism of John the Scot in Berengar. *Cf.* Geiselmann, p. 364.

[6] *D.S.C.*, p. 119 f. The orthodox writers use 'supersubstantialis' (ἐπιούσιον) to overcome the material implications of realism.

He denies that the statement 'the bread and wine of the altar are only sacraments' was made by him. On the contrary, his contention is that when it is stated that the bread and wine are sacraments there is no abolition of the bread and wine, but another name is applied to their natural designations, a name which is quite unconnected with their nature—the name 'sacrament.' Their particular designation is exchanged for a general term, or, at least, a general term is thrown around their particular designations, without obliterating the specific substances of bread and wine.[1] If this is realism, it consists rather in the terminology than in the content of Berengar's thought. It does not pass beyond idealism, for the 'particulars' bread and wine are retained. They make generally effective the body of Christ which has an 'ideal,' a real-heavenly existence.

This appears to be the distinction drawn by him between the 'sacrament' and the 'thing of the sacrament.'[2] If a sacrament exists, it cannot reasonably be denied that the thing of the sacrament (res sacramenti) exists. To be a sacrament and to be 'only' (solum) cannot be demonstrated of anything.[3] The term 'sacrament' (sacramentum) describes the 'particulars,' the consecrated bread and wine. The 'res sacramenti' is the heavenly body of Christ, a universal[4] applicable to all who receive the sacrament worthily. He never identifies, in the realist-metabolist sense, the sacrament with its spiritual content. If the terms 'body' and 'blood' are used, as he admits they may be,[5] with reference to the sacramental body of Christ in heaven, they can only be used in a figurative sense, which is the only usage sanctioned by Scripture.[6]

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 67; *cf.* p. 231, etc. In no contention is Berengar more consistent than in his constant assertion that the substance of bread and wine remains intact after consecration.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 203, 231, 237, 245, 255, 283, 285, 287, etc.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 114.

[4] But Berengar had no theory of 'universals' in the regular scholastic sense. This did not appear in the Middle Ages until the time of John of Salisbury (d. 1180) in the twelfth century (Reade, 795, 805 ff.).

[5] *D.S.C.*, p. 113.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 86. Bach, i. 372 (quoting *D.S.C.*, p. 161), sees contradiction in Berengar's teaching. While the substance of bread and wine remains, yet it is 'ein Anderes aber wird es secundum quod, in Hinsicht auf sein Was (seine Quidditat oder Substanz).'

The use of the terms 'figure' and 'similitude'[1] is as frequent and consistent as in his earlier writings. He maintains that the view of John the Scot, that the consecrated elements on the altar are the figure, sign, pledge, similitude of the Lord's body, is also that of Augustine, Ambrose, and Jerome.[2] As Christ was only sacrificed once, the eucharistic sacrifice can only be a figure of the sacrifice of Christ. The difference between the symbols of the Old and New Testaments is that the former represented what had not yet taken place, whereas the latter are representations of an existing thing.[3] Thus the manna was only a shadow of the eucharistic feeding.[4] He issues a caution against the misuse of symbolism by Lanfranc. Christ was not a sacrament of Himself, and the journey to Emmaus did not symbolise the Ascension as Lanfranc alleged.[5] Lanfranc reverses the symbolism of the corner-stone.[6] Berengar had used it to prove the reality of the body of Christ. If Augustine thought that a crystal was made from snow, and called a crystal by the name 'snow,' he did not reverse the symbolism and call snow a crystal.[7] One term of the sacramental formula is to be taken in a literal, and the other in a figurative, sense. The bread is literal, the body is figurative.[8] But his sacramental theory does not waive aside the spiritual body and blood of Christ with an assertion that the consecrated elements are a mere picture or representation of their spiritual counterpart. Bare symbolism followed upon Zwinglianism. Nor, on the contrary, does he embody the Greek conception of a symbol which is in some mysterious way the very thing symbolised.[9] His conception lies between these two extremes, and is similar to the transvaluation theory put forward by Dr. Temple.[10] The consecrated elements make available for the receiver the effective virtue of the body of Christ,[11] so that an influence is exerted on the soul of the believer. His illustrations of symbolism are significant. Christ is the corner-stone [1]—exerts in the Church the effect of a corner-stone. 'Dust thou art, and to dust shalt thou return' [2]—the final effective value of mankind is only that of the dust of the earth. In the sacraments one thing is seen, another is apprehended by the mind. That which is seen has corporal form, that which is apprehended by the mind has spiritual fruit [3]—produces a spiritual effect—the invisible grace being mediated in a visible form as Augustine said.[4] The sacraments feed the body, but the 'thing of the sacrament' we receive in the inner man, that we may feed the mind,[5] a statement which is almost a quotation from John the Scot.[6]

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, pp. 69, 75, 81, 220, 232, 240 ff., 244, 250 ff., 255, 258, 264, etc. 'tropica locutione' is a frequent expression.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 37 f.: 'figuram, sigmum, pignus' (*cf.* p. 43, etc.). The term 'pignus' is derived from Optatus of Milevia, fl. 365–378 (Migne, 11, 1065a), and Augustine (*Sermo*, 334, 2. Adam, p. 76, gives wrongly 335, 2).

[3] *D.S.C.*, p. 43.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 149.

[5] *Ibid.* pp. 201, 203.

[6] *Ibid.* pp. 77, 83.

[7] *Ibid.* pp. 75, 78.

[8] *Ibid.* p. 83.

[9] *Cf.* Bach, i. 378.

[10] *Christus Veritas* (1924), p. 247.

[11] *Cf.* Schwane, p. 638.

This leads on to his conception of the effect of consecration, and the nature of the sacramental process. Consecration does not result in the dissolution (corruptio) of one substance and in the creation of another.[7] Augustine indeed taught that metabolism took place in nature, when the substance of food is changed into the bodies of animals,[8] but the substances of bread and wine do not cease to be, nor are substances of body and blood created when the former are blessed by the priest. Nothing can lose materially by consecration the property of its nature.[9] In support of his criticism of metabolism he makes use of the Aristotelean theory of matter,[10] without, however, adopting the complete Aristotelean conception of form (species) as belonging to the substance of matter. He applies the term 'form' [11] to the perceptible qualities of a thing, which supply it with identity, and so equates 'substance' with 'matter,' and 'form' with 'accidence.' Thus form and accidence in his idea are not unessential or contingent qualities, but necessary concomitants of the substance or matter.[1] He admits the category of essence only in the sense of a materially existing form, and so denies the mystical or 'real' presence in the Eucharist, in favour of a natural or rational interpretation.[2] The application of the concept of accidence to the unessential or contingent qualities of matter belongs to the era when Scolasticism was fully developed. Berengar's teaching marked a step in advance, and the intermediate stage was supplied by Alan of Lille.[3]

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 75.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 76.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 267: 'aliud videtur et aliud intelligitur. Quod videtur, speciem habet corporalem, quod intelligitur, fructum habet spiritualem.' *Cf.* p. 285, also pp. 151, 154, 158. The expressions 'intelligere' and 'intelligibilis' mean more than 'to understand' or 'intelligible' in medieval thought. They signify a grasping by the mind, reception by the mind (and, in eucharistic terminology), as if it fed upon that which it receives.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 114, etc.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 285: 'per res sacramentorum . . . mente reficiamur.' This is almost his last statement on the sacrament. *Cf.* pp. 223, 274, 287.

[6] *Evang. in Joan.*, 25, 12 (Migne, 122, 311b. *Cf.* Nägle, p. 127).

[7] *D.S.C.*, pp. 68 ff., 90 ff., 123 f., 129, 132, 212, 230, etc.

[8] *Ibid.* p. 93.

[9] *Ibid.* p. 122: 'amittere sensualiter proprietatem naturae suae.'

[10] Geiselmann, pp. 334, 360, says that Berengar's conception of existence (Seinsbegriff), following Ratramn, is materialistic (sensualistischen).

[11] 'Forma,' cf. *D.S.C.*, pp. 92, 193, 195, 211. 'Species,' *ibid.* pp. 202, 213, etc.

According to Berengar everything has two properties. It is one thing in that which it is. It is another thing in the sense in which anything is.[4] The distinction between particulars and universals was not far beyond the horizon of Berengar's thought. His meaning is that everything is one thing in its special identity, and another thing so far as it shares its 'materia' or substance with everything else—so far as it is universal.

His next proposition has the appearance of a logical quibble. 'Nothing can exist subject to the contingency of ceasing to be itself.'[5] But his meaning is that special identity cannot be separated from substantial existence. 'If you say,' he argues, 'that Socrates is righteous, you have stated him to be something, but he cannot be righteous if he ceases to exist.'[6] A man may be a stern Cato in character, but he cannot have the character of a Cato if he does not exist.[1] Again, Cato is dead; Brutus, who still lives, imitates him, and both were bald-headed. You may reasonably say that Brutus is Cato in baldness, but not that Cato is Brutus in baldness, because Cato is dead.[2] If Laelius is called a Cicero in eloquence, Cethegus a Catiline in wickedness, it does not follow that Cicero and Catiline are present, but Laelius and Cethegus must be present.[3] Or, to take Fulbert's illustration, a slave becomes a soldier, a soldier becomes a son, or Hercules becomes a god, but in neither case does the original man cease to be.[4] A bad servant who becomes good does not lose the properties of soul and body.[5] When Saul became Paul, his human nature did not cease to be.[6] Thus if the qualities of bread and wine are present their substance cannot be absent.

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, pp. 70, 81, 92, 127, 134, 181, 193 ff., 201 f., 221. He appears to have reached this conception when his *Opusculum* was written (Migne, 150, 416c, 420d). If the second footnote, *D.S.C.*, p. 101, contains a genuine marginal note by Berengar, we have an interesting illustration of his terminology: 'quid informis materia, quid formatum animae, quid corpus, quid species in corpus.' Its Aristotelean terminology belongs to a later period of medieval thought. So probably the note is that of a commentator.

[2] Endres, *Görresgesellschaft Phil. Jahrbuch*, xxvi. 169.

[3] *Cf.* Geiselmann, pp. 337–341. Schnitzer, p. 250 n. 3, says that Berengar used 'species' in two senses: (1) = subjectum = substantia; (2) = accidentia. This is doubtful. In most of the references given by Schnitzer, Berengar is quoting Ambrose or Augustine, and he uses their terms. But on pp. 202 and 213 he uses 'species' definitely of accidence or qualities. Schnitzer does not quote from p. 213.

[4] *D.S.C.*, p. 70: 'omne, quod est, aliud esse in eo, quod est, aliud in eo, quod aliquid est.' *Cf.* p. 81.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 70: 'nec posse quippiam aliquid esse, cui contingat, ipsum non esse.'

[6] *Ibid.* p. 70.

If my finger is destroyed by fire its straightness (collineatio) can still survive in a finger modelled of wood or stone, but this argument does not bear on the question, because the statement is concerned with two different objects—my finger and wood or stone [7]—and this is equivalent to admitting that specific qualities cease to be if the materia or substance is destroyed. The statement directly negatives his proposition that nothing can exist subject to the contingency of ceasing to be itself, and, on the contrary, admits that specific qualities may be shared by different objects.

Yet when applied to the sacramental process his argument is valid. For to allege that through consecration the original essence (pristina essentia) of the bread and wine has disappeared, and that they only exist in appearance (specie), is unjustifiable, for that cannot exist which is no longer in the substance in which it was.[8] The substance being destroyed, qualities which accompanied it, such as colour, cannot survive.[9]

The sacramental process does not resemble the change of Lot's wife into a pillar of salt, or the wand of Moses into a serpent [10]—illustrations used by Ambrose—or even the change in the nature of the iron which Elisha caused to float like wood.[1] In these cases, neither the serpent nor the pillar existed before the change, and the woman and the rod ceased to exist after it.[2] Metabolism in these instances can be explained either as the change of a disposition into a condition, or the promotion of a lower condition into a higher, or through the destruction of one condition and the institution of another.[3] Expressed in other terms, these three modes of change may be said to take place—through the total destruction of the original object; by a change of condition while the original element is preserved; or by the merging of two existing things without destruction or new creation.[4]

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 213.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 213.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 214.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 98.
[5] *Ibid.* p. 90.
[6] *Ibid.* p. 144.
[7] *Ibid.* p. 93.
[8] *Ibid.* p. 213.
[9] *Ibid.* pp. 93, 171 ('nulla ratione colorem videri, nisi contingat etiam coloratum videri'), 182, 194 ('Impossibile est . . . corrupto subjecto non corrumpi quod erat in subjecto'), 227.
[10] *D.S.C.*, pp. 91, 94, 163, 180, 210, 217 f.

Matter can change its form. Gold becomes a ring, brass becomes a dish, marble can be shaped into a pear, and wood into a bow, but the original material remains in each case.[5] So, then, consecration does not annihilate the substances of bread and wine, nor does it bring into existence, by a process of creation (generatio), the body and blood of Christ.[6] The body of Christ can be no longer clothed with matter or flesh, since 'Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more' and 'now know we Christ no more after the flesh.'[7] God does not create Christ's flesh from bread by a miracle, as Lanfranc alleged; such a view brings God into contempt, for it implies that Christ's body can be wounded again, when the sacrament is eaten.[8] The body of Christ has been in existence for a thousand years, it cannot therefore come into existence at consecration.[9] Berengar does not speak of a body present in the Eucharist, but of the heavenly Word operating in the bread and wine.[10] The change in the elements is not a simple conversion (conversio) of one substance into another,[11] but a hallowing of the bread and wine so that they may possess the potency and effectiveness of the body and blood. They are no longer merely the elements which nature formed, but are also that which blessing has effected. Their conversion is their consecration,[1] and the substance of bread and wine now possesses the saving and life-giving efficacy of the body and blood of Christ, just as if one were to speak of a saving and life-giving substance in a saving and life-giving substance.[2] The earthly substance of the elements now confers on us what is divine, and in this sense the sacrifice of Christ consists of the visible and the invisible, the sacrament and the thing of the sacrament.[3]

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, pp. 141, 180. [2] *Ibid.* p. 94, etc. [3] *Ibid.* p. 95 f.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 161; *cf.* pp. 185, 217. [5] *Ibid.* p. 79.
[6] *Ibid.* pp. 90 ff., 252. [7] *Ibid.* pp. 95, 96. [8] *Ibid.* p. 96 f.
[9] *Ibid.* pp. 156, 164, 189, etc.
[10] *Ibid.* p. 230: 'coelestem sermonem in pane et vino operari.' *Cf.* p. 248.
[11] *Cf.* Harnack, vi. 49 n. 5. Berengar does not use 'conversio' in the sense of transmutation, but rather as a divine 'auctio.' But would not this cause him to approximate to the Paschasian 'nova creatio'?

While the elements remain what they were, they are changed into 'other,' as Augustine[4] and Ambrose[5] said. They are raised to a higher value[6] or significance. Their relativity has been altered. In this sense only can we interpret his statement that he does not deny the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament. 'Ye have this most certainly that I say the bread and wine of the altar after consecration are the body and blood of Christ,'[7] and this was the belief he confessed at Tours.[8] He declines to go beyond the simple language of Scripture (*sic*)—'the bread and wine through consecration are converted on the altar into the true body and blood of Christ.'[9] This is really Ambrosian language, but he always qualifies it with the explanation that the substance of the elements remains. The realist term 'conficere' is equated with 'consecrare.' The body of Christ can only be said to be prepared *as a sacrament* of the body of Christ,[10] and the preparation or consecration is confined to the elements.[11] He contends that even Lanfranc, who attempted to define the mode of the conversion, did not make his meaning clear.[1]

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 188.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 134: 'si diceret: salvatricem vivicatricemque substantiam in salvatrice vivicatriceque substantia.' *Cf.* p. 136.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 283. [4] *Ibid.* p. 163. [5] *Ibid.* pp. 140 ff., 146, 248, etc.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 116: 'in melius provehi'; p. 156: 'in ulteriora proficiunt.'

[7] *Ibid.* pp. 51, 136. These passages and that on p. 57, together with one statement in the 'Epis. to Adelmann' (*supra*, p. 258), and another in the *Acta Conc. Rom.* (*infra*, p. 361), are the only authority in Berengar's teaching for the claim that he taught the doctrine of the real presence. This is only possible if they are isolated from the rest of his teaching.

[8] *Ibid.* p. 52. [9] *Ibid.* p. 57.

[10] *Ibid.* p. 89: 'non enim . . . confici corpus Christi, nisi in quo accipiendum sit id, quod dicatur corpus Christi pro eo, quod est sacramentum corporis Christi.' 'Conficere' in class. Lat. = celebrate the sacred rites; in 4th cent. Lat. = consecrate (Jerome, Siricius, Ambrose). Gradually it became associated not with the bread as object, but with that which the bread signified after consecration, and so acquired the force of 'efficere,' a usage which appears in the *De Sacramentis*. This usage was criticised by Berengar.

[11] *Ibid.* 188: 'Rerum exteriorum est, panis et vini est, confici, consecrari.'

The process of consecration, in which the divine Word is the effective principle,[2] operates in a mystical way.[3] The faithful feed on the body of Christ and drink His blood through a mystery,[4] a mystery which was destroyed by Lanfranc's theory when he alleged that the body of Christ is actually broken by the hands of the priest.[5] The mysteries supply us with the effect of salvation, and the pledge of salvation we receive through the office of the priest.[6] Thus the sacramental theory of Berengar—his conception of the process of consecration—embodies the mystic symbolism of Alexandria and other Greek centres, but, unlike the Greeks, he distinguishes between the symbol and that which it symbolises.

In contrast with realist ideas, it will be noted that his chief contribution to the history of the controversy was the emphasis which he laid upon the survival of the substance of bread and wine after consecration. This obvious fact of experience was indicated by Ratramn, but the extravagant language of contemporary metabolism made it necessary for Berengar constantly to draw attention to it. But he did not remain content with a mere memorialist interpretation. Through the mystery of consecration a change takes place in the effectiveness of the elements, and through this operation they become a sacrament, the pledge of salvation and the medium of spiritual life. The consecrated or sacramental bread and wine have a religious value. The 'thing of the sacrament,' its spiritual reality, is the body of Christ which is in heaven, and does not leave it until the end of the age. The body of Christ is thus the ideal archetype of the consecrated elements, which may be called 'body and blood,' but only in a figurative, tropical, or symbolical sense. The consecrated elements symbolise a spiritual body which really exists, and so far as it is represented to us in the sacrament it is made available to us for spiritual purposes. It is, however, apprehended by the mind, and although possessing objective existence itself, its effect is produced upon us subjectively by this noumenal or spiritual feeding. The subjective character of sacramental feeding is made clear by this contention that the sacramental—as distinguished from the real-heavenly body—exists for the recipient only. Even the Canon of the Mass asks that the sacramental body may become not an offering for all, but a body for us.[1] In some contemporary realist theory the sacramental body has an objective existence, and can be received by men, beasts, and birds, and can be consumed by fire. Berengar emphasised a spiritual feeding by the mind, and by this means the effects of the Incarnation and the Cross establish the inward life.[2] To take refuge in reason is a condition of renewal according to the image of God ; it is a condition of salvation.[3] The rational creature aspires through grace to union with Christ.[4] Thus to feed spiritually in the Eucharist is to absorb the saving effect of the Incarnation and Passion.[5]

---

[1] *D.S.C.* p. 57. [2] *Supra*, p. 277.

[3] *D.S.C.* p. 67: 'certa mistica consecratione.' *Cf.* p. 136.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 283: 'per misterium.' *Cf.* p. 285. [5] *Ibid.* p. 283.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 286: 'illius salutaris capiamus effectum, cujus per haec ministeria pignus accepimus.'

Berengar's system does not involve a theory of Transubstantiation, only a conversion of value or efficacy. The conversion of a sinner does not involve the destruction of his mortal life.[6] If Peter Gerald becomes a bishop, after consecration he is different in character, not in substance.[7] As Cyprian said, a young man who has been enticed away from virtue by a woman, but who repents and leaves her, can say 'You are the same, but I am now different.'[8] There is no equation between a conversion of substance and a change of substance. The consecrated bread and wine and the glorified body of Christ are in different categories. There can be no displacement of the substance of the one without displacing its accidents. The metabolism by which food is changed into human flesh and blood cannot be applied to the sacrament. For the rest, he leaves the relationship between the consecrated elements and the heavenly body of Christ wrapped in mystery. He makes no attempt to solve the problem by postulating a eucharistic body of Christ distinct from a heavenly body.

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 278.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 222 f.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 101.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 226 : 'rationalis creatura.'
[5] *Ibid.* p. 238.
[6] *Ibid.* p. 146.
[7] *Ibid.* p. 178.
[8] *Ibid.* p. 178 f.

In this case Christ would be a sacrament of Himself, as Lanfranc tried to prove by his appeal to the journey to Emmaus.[1] The sacrament has the efficacy of the heavenly body of Christ and no other, and only so far as the heavenly body is the body received from the Virgin in its resurrected condition, does he associate the 'thing of the sacrament' with the historical body of Christ.[2] He rejects every attempt to identify the two through a transubstantiation of the bread into the historical body as Lanfranc taught. Nor does he adopt the dualistic notion of Irenæus which attempts to effect the real presence of Christ by a process similar to that of the Incarnation.[3] Berengar's illustration from the Incarnation is modified by the qualification that the Word assumed what it was not, without ceasing to be what it was ;[4] but it cannot be denied that the appeal to the Incarnation militates against his own theory of the sacrament.

Luther rejected the theory of Berengar and maintained that he was rightly condemned by Pope Nicholas II. Certainly Berengar's doctrine is not the Lutheran theory of Consubstantiation.[5] The substance of the body of Christ is not present with the substance of bread and wine in the Eucharist. If there were a consubstantial sacramental union, the process would involve a thousand thousand bodies of Christ on the altar every day, a result which Berengar denies.[6] He nowhere states that there are two substances in the Eucharist, and it was an impossible conclusion to his thesis. The sacrament consists of one substance only—that of bread and wine. His interpretation of the Augustinian 'thing of the sacrament' does not set up a concomitance, but a mystical archetypal entity which the sacrament makes available. In Berengar's system the Platonism of John the Scot was again active. The believer effects a contact with the 'sacrament' or objective consecrated bread and wine only. The 'thing of the sacrament,' the archetypal body of Christ, is apprehended only by the heart, by the eye of the mind, so that only a subjective contact is effected with the 'thing of the sacrament.' Thus, if the sacramental system of Berengar did not embody Consubstantiation, it embraced much more than the bare memorialism of Reformation times which taught that the sacrament was a mere token of the reception of grace, and a mere commemoration of Christ's death. Among the classical Reformers the teaching of Berengar appears again in the Receptionism of Calvin, which made a valid reception dependent upon the condition of the recipient, and while holding that Christ's body was in heaven and could not descend to the altar, yet conceived of its reception in a mystical way by the faithful.

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 203 f.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 191, 245.

[3] *Cf.* Rückert, *Das Abendmahl . . . in der alten Kirche*, p. 502.

[4] *D.S.C.*, p. 98 f.

[5] On Berengar's place in the history of doctrine *cf.* Schnitzer, pp. 300–315.

[6] *D.S.C.*, p. 198 ; *supra*, p. 310.

Berengar claims that his teaching has the support of Augustine, Ambrose, Hilary, and Gregory the Great.[1] He also refers to Jerome [2] and Cyprian,[3] Leo the Great,[4] Faustus of Riez,[5] and Fulbert.[6] This appeal to tradition, which supplements the authority of Scripture, is made within defined limits. A text is not to be taken in isolation. What is obscure is to be interpreted by a comparison with other passages.[7] Ambrose and Augustine are the writers chiefly quoted by him, and most of his quotations are taken from Ambrose,[8] who supplied the chief armoury for the weapons of his antagonists. He admits that he does not always quote Ambrose verbatim, but contends that the doctrine of a change of essence does not appear in the teaching of that writer, yet he was only able to arrive at this conclusion by a partial use of his own principle of interpretation. He selects Ambrosian statements which are relevant to his own theory, and disregards the rest. Ambrose teaches that the effect of the words of institution in consecration is to supply the elements with a new significance, without causing their material existence to cease.[9] If Ambrose alleges [10] that the force of consecration is greater than that of nature, so that the consecrated elements may be described as being not what nature formed, but what blessing has hallowed, it does not follow that Ambrose means that the elements of bread and wine, formed by nature, are destroyed on the altar, for no comparison can take place unless two things actually exist.[1]

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 275. [2] *Ibid.* pp. 36, 38, 50, 237, 269, 276 f.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 27, 34, 39, 44, 48, 58, 86, 178. [4] *Ibid.* p. 274 ff.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 90, under the name of Eusebius of Emesa.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 98. [7] *Ibid.* pp. 173, 248.

[8] Ambrosian writings are mentioned on about 120 pages of the *D.S.C.*; those of Augustine on about 90 pages.

[9] *D.S.C.*, p. 141 ff., etc. [10] *De Myst.*, ix. (Migne, 16, 405c).

Moreover, Berengar was able to strengthen his appeal to Ambrose by quoting the Ambrosian *De Sacramentis*, which was generally regarded as genuine in those days. The *De Sacramentis* stated that the consecrated elements of bread and wine remain what they were.[2] That he does not refer to a complete change of substance is proved by his use of the term 'quae' (not 'quod') of the bread and wine in a personal sense.[3] If the writer had conceived of a destruction of essence, he would have said that the bread and wine ceased to be what they were,[4] but he has said that they are 'as' (qualia) they were.[5] If the elements become body and blood, then the offering of bread and wine by Melchizedek to Abraham could not have taken place, for Melchizedek did not offer flesh and blood, which did not yet exist.[6]

The words of institution, and especially the words 'this which is broken' (hoc . . . fractum), show that the Lord offered bread to the disciples, and He spoke of bread which was 'broken for many,' not of a body which 'was offered for many.'[7] So also, when the Word of Christ approaches that which before (antequam) was bread, so that it becomes body, the writer does not mean that bread has ceased to be, for the Word supplements and does not destroy the bread.[8] The use of the pronoun 'hunc' distinguishes the consecrated from the unconsecrated bread, but not so far as to obliterate the essence of the latter;[1] and because he speaks of a host without blood (incruenta hostia) he could not have conceived of a small portion of blood in the cup.[2] The apostle referred to a saving and life-giving substance in the bread and wine.[3] The Ambrosian phrase 'that that which is bread may be the body of Christ' cannot indicate a change of essence, for then he would have said 'that which was bread.' Neither can it mean 'that that which is the body of Christ may be bread,' according to the folly (ineptia) of Lanfranc.[4] He who speaks of bread cannot deny the existence of bread.[5] That the elements remain after consecration is proved by the Ambrosian statement that they can be seen and marvelled at on the altar.[6] Ambrose even calls the consecrated elements a figure (figura) and image (imago) of the body and blood of the Lord, which would be a contradiction of himself if he also thought that a small portion of the flesh and blood was there.[7] Ambrose maintains that the flesh and blood cannot be seen on the altar.[8] If it were, it would create repulsion in the recipient.[9] When he says that just as Christ is the Son of His Father according to substance, so His flesh and blood are true, the statement does not refer to corporal eating and drinking, but is really directed against the Arians on the one hand, who asserted that Christ was only a man, and against the Manichees on the other, who alleged that He was merely a phantom.[10]

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, pp. 160 f., 218 f.

[2] Migne, 16, 441a (*De Sac.*, iv. 4). *Cf.* Thompson and Srawley, p. 110 f., on the interpretation of the phrase.

[3] *D.S.C.*, p. 210: 'quasi personaliter,' *i.e.* the Ambrosian language preserves the form or qualities of the bread and wine.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 210, etc.: 'ut desinant esse quae fuerant.' Lanfranc (Migne, 150, 420d f.) tried to extend the meaning of the passage by quoting a variant reading. Berengar (p. 210) criticises him. Gore (*Dissertations*, p. 230 n. 1) accepts Berengar's reading. Rückert (*Das Abendmahl*, p. 473 n. *) accepts Lanfranc's reading.

[5] *D.S.C.*, p. 212.

[6] *Ibid.* pp. 129, 168, 172, 205. The reference to Melchizedek goes back to Clem. of Alex., *Strom.*, iv. 25, 163.

[7] *D.S.C.*, p. 232, quoting *De Sacramentis*, iv. 5 (Migne, 16, 443b): 'fregit fractumque apostolis suis traditur.'

[8] *D.S.C.*, p. 233 f.

Berengar recapitulates the illustration drawn by Ambrose from Baptism. The crossing of the Red Sea by the Jews signified Baptism, and long before their epoch it was signified by the Flood. Baptism was instituted by the Lord Jesus and is comparable with the Eucharist; indeed, it has a certain precedence over the latter, for while many communions are necessary to salvation, only one baptism is required.[11] The water is converted through the consecrating Word, but it remains water, although it is now a rejuvenating bath, and signifies, in similitude, the death of Christ.[1] Naaman was healed by the water of Jordan through a process similar to Baptism.[2] Without the preaching of the Cross, and consecration by the mystery of the Cross, the water is valueless. Without water there is no mystery of regeneration, so without bread and wine there is no mystery of feeding, although the water does not save unless the Holy Spirit shall have consecrated it.[3] Ambrose thought in precisely the same terms of the Eucharist.[4] In addition to his own comments on the teaching of Ambrose,[5] Berengar adds an independent comparison drawn between Baptism and the Eucharist. Death and resurrection are symbolised by Baptism,[6] and the Eucharist is a symbolical drinking of the blood,[7] which is no more actually consumed in the Eucharist than actually present as a purifying medium in Baptism.[8] As the material element is not changed in Baptism, so it is not changed in the Eucharist.[9]

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, pp. 133, 174, 234; *cf.* p. 85 (commenting on *De Sacrament.*, iv. 6).
[2] *D.S.C.*, pp. 174, 234.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 134.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 189 (cf. *De Sacrament.*, iv. 4; Migne, 16, 440a).
[5] *D.S.C.*, pp. 140, 208.
[6] *Ibid.* p. 132; *cf*. pp. 174, 204.
[7] *Ibid.* p. 175 f.
[8] *Ibid.* p. 171.
[9] *Ibid.* p. 254 ff.
[10] *Ibid.* p. 238.
[11] *Ibid.* p. 153 f. An idea which appears so early as the third century (*cf.* Harnack, ii. 138 ff.). *Cf. infra*, p. 365.

The strength of the grip maintained by tradition upon the medieval mind is further illustrated by Berengar's contention that there was no conflict of ideas between the teaching of Ambrose and that of Augustine.[10] Criticism was in its early stages. It was exercising its weapons in assault. It had not yet perceived that in dialectics a consistent victory includes a process of surrender, and that, when an appeal is made to authority or tradition, neither side can claim the undivided allegiance of the alliance. Berengar was attempting to devour the apple and yet to leave it on the tree. Ambrose and Augustine alike distinguish between the sacrament and what belongs to it,[11] alike they assert that the sacrament is a visible entity.[12] The comparison is only generally true if the contrasts are ignored. Berengar attempted to twist the Ambrosian realism to serve his own interpretation.[13] He was on safer ground when he examined the teaching of Augustine.[1] According to Augustine, although the bread and wine 'by a certain consecration become mystical for us,'[2] and to the eye of faith are now the body and blood of the Lord, yet the elements of bread and wine remain.[3] The realists maintained that Augustine supported their view, yet in his *Sermo ad neophytos* he made it clear that the substances of bread and wine are not wanting, and they are called bread and wine by a literal, not by a figurative description.[4] What is seen on the altar is bread and wine—bread made from many grains, and wine from many berries,[5] as also Cyprian originally taught.[6] They have the similitude of the things of which they are sacraments.[7] Augustine distinguishes between two things in the Eucharist—that which is seen, and that which is grasped by the mind (intelligitur). That which is seen has material form (speciem habet corporalem), that which is apprehended by the mind has spiritual fruit (fructum habet spiritualem). The sacrament is veritable and temporal.[8] Sanctification is a process related to the thing itself, not merely to its qualities.[9] Even if Augustine allows that the bread and wine by a mystical consecration become body and blood, it cannot be concluded from his teaching that he obliterates their substance, so that the sacrament became, as Lanfranc maintained, merely a symbol of the bread and wine.[10] When the Lord commended His body and blood to the disciples, He did not mean that the elements of the bread and wine were annihilated. One can neither commend nor consecrate what does not survive.[11]

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, pp. 151 f., 154 f., 186.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 151. He also sees in the attitude of Naaman an illustration of Lanfranc's 'contempt' for the bread and wine. *Ibid.* pp. 168, 172, 204 f.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 152.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 172.

[5] *Cf.* Geiselmann, p. 358 f., for a tabulated comparison of the teaching of Ambrose and Berengar on Baptism and the Eucharist.

[6] *D.S.C.*, p. 157.

[7] *Ibid.* pp. 223, 225.

[8] *Ibid.* p. 222.

[9] *Ibid.* p. 128 f.

[10] *Ibid.* p. 167; *cf.* p. 164 f.

[11] *Ibid.* p. 135 f.

[12] *Ibid.* p. 197.

[13] *Ibid.* p. 176; *cf.* p. 173.

In Berengar's correspondence no early Father is more constantly quoted than Augustine.[12] The influence of Augustine upon Berengar was noticed by Guitmund [1] and Hugh Metellus.[2] His refusal to see any change of metabolic character in the Eucharist; the use of the term 'figura'; [3] the conception of an inward and spiritual feeding; the representation of consecration in a mystical setting; the refusal to bring down the glorified body of Christ in order to identify it with the eucharistic body; the conception of the relation between the Eucharist and the body of Christ in heaven, in the terms of the Platonic type and archetype; the difference between a sign and the thing signified, between the outward visible form and the inward invisible grace—are all Augustinian notions.[4] Moreover, like Augustine, he does not altogether break away from current realist language. So, in addition to his formal criticism of the doctrine of the real presence and of Transubstantiation, the titles applied by Berengar to the Eucharist are significant. It is the 'Lord's Table,' [5] the 'Celebration or Meal of the Lord's Table,' [6] the 'Sacrifice of the Church,' [7] the 'Sacraments of the Altar,' [8] the 'Sacraments of Religion,' [9] and more rarely the 'Eucharist.' [10] The conception of a supper or sacrament predominates over that of sacrifice, which indeed he never formally discusses. This terminology is not realist, even at its extremity it is never more than sacramental.

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 256 ff.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 136: 'certa consecratione misticus fit nobis.'

[3] *Ibid.* p. 137.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 259.

[5] *Ibid.* pp. 87, 170 (quoting *Sermo*, p. 272: Migne, 38, 1247, and *In Joan*, Tr. xxvi.: Migne, 35, 1614).

[6] *D.S.C.*, p. 86 (quoting Cyprian, 'Epis.' 63, 13).

[7] *D.S.C.*, pp. 225, 242.

[8] *Ibid.* p. 197.

[9] *Ibid.* p. 166: 'non enim sanctificatur quod in subjecto est, sed subjectum.'

[10] *Ibid.* p. 242.

[11] *Ibid.* p. 242 f. *Cf.* Geiselmann, p. 353 f.

[12] *Cf.* Sudendorf, pp. 201, 204, 209, 212, 215, 217, 226. Ambrose is seldom mentioned in the letters. In the *De Sacra Cœna* he tried to turn Lanfranc's position by claiming Ambrose's authority for his own teaching. *Cf.* Harnack, vi. 47. Berengar was an Augustinian, but (p. 50) he had

Towards the end of his book Berengar appeals to all who are learned in the school of Christ, who have patience enough to read what he has written against Lanfranc. They will find that he has said nothing contrary to truth, and only that

---

an enjoyment in criticism and confidence in Science which Augustine did not possess.

[1] Hurter, xxxviii. 118.

[2] 'Epis. to Gerland' (Mabillon, *Vet. Anal.*, p. 475; *cf.* Mabillon's observations, p. 476).

[3] Migne, 34, 75.

[4] Geiselmann, p. 362 f.

[5] 'Mensa dominica.' *D.S.C.*, pp. 32, 36 f., 53, 55, 68, 70, 75, 77 f., 81, 84, 97, 107, 118, 126 f., 131 f., 139, 143, 163 f., 172 f., 177, 179, 205, 215, 217 ff., 229 ff., 233, 254, 259, 261, 274 f.

[6] 'Celebratio (refectio) mensae dominicae.' *Ibid.* pp. 63, 96, 98, 215.

[7] 'Sacrificium ecclesiae—populi Christiani—Christi—altaris: oblatio altaris.' *Ibid.* pp. 38 n. 1, 69, 74 n. 1, 81, 97, 107, 125, 131, 138, 140, 141, 158, 179, 192, 213, 245, 274, 283.

[8] 'Sacramenta altaris—corporis Christi.' *Ibid.* pp. 38 n. 1, 145, 158 f., 168, 170, 217, 219, 227, 274, 276.

[9] 'Sacramenta religionis.' *Ibid.* pp. 125, 127.

[10] 'Eucharistia.' *Ibid.* pp. 44, 51, 286.

which possesses the authority of the prophets and apostles, of the Lord of the prophets and apostles, and of the great Fathers of the Western Church.[1] He has made out his claim. The realists of the pre-scholastic era had used the sources of authority to support a philosophic theory of the sacramental change, which in turn was an attempt to substantiate the crude realism of the Mass-cultus. Philosophy in their hands became a mere handmaid to ceremonial. So the teaching of Berengar took the form of a protest, and issued in a demand for eucharistic reform. It constituted a call to return to Augustine, whose teaching, as Luther proved, was the point at which the medieval church had departed from the true line of advance. Back to Augustine, and to a spiritual interpretation of Scripture—that was Berengar's note, and even the realists never again attempted to define the Eucharist in the terms of the formula of Humbert.[2] Although Berengar failed to check the formulation of the dogma of Transubstantiation, his protest bore fruit in the form of a more restrained terminology, and a sounder philosophic grasp in the leading writers of later times.

---

[1] *D.S.C.*, p. 275.

[2] In 1556 Sir John Cheke was compelled to recite Humbert's confession (Darwell Stone, ii. 167). Cardinal Bellarmine defended the terms of this confession (*ibid.* ii. 366). Gore, *The Body of Christ*, p. 117, describes it as 'a gross and horrible doctrine.' 'Stercoristan' or 'Capharnaitic,' *i.e.* grossly physical statements, were condemned by most Catholic writers. The term 'Stercoristan' was first used by Humbert in 1054 in controversy with the Greeks (Nägle, p. 174 n. 2). It refers to the disposal of the sacramental elements after human metabolism has taken place. 'Capharnaitic' was a general term referring to the physical presence of the flesh and blood of Christ, derived from 'Capernaum.' The Capernaites interpreted Christ's words materially (S. John vi. 41, 52).

CHAPTER XVII

ANTI-DIALECTIC CONSERVATIVES

In the second half of the eleventh century eucharistic doctrine was interpreted by three modes of inquiry. Berengar headed the dialectic dynamic symbolists and gave scientific expression to the tradition of John the Scot and Ratramn. The method also claimed an unrestricted use of dialectics for the explanation and vindication of the ancient western Fathers. Lanfranc and Guitmund, the dialectical realists, developed the tradition of Paschasius Radbert, and while condemning the free dialectical method of Berengar, none the less conducted their inquiry along dialectical lines within clearly defined limits. To this they were pledged by the aims and conditions of the Benedictine educational revival. Logic was in use in famous monastic schools like Bec, as well as in cathedral centres like Tours, and one of the objects of the educational revival was to break away from the mere study of grammar and patristic texts, and to train the intellect for a philosophical defence of the traditional faith. The process issued in the work of Anselm of Canterbury and the scholastics of the twelfth century. But whereas Berengar boldly advanced the conclusions to which dialectical investigation inevitably led, the school of Lanfranc and Guitmund did not go beyond the reconstruction of the old system of eucharistic doctrine, and were content to limit the use of dialectics to those occasions when it appeared to support the traditional statement. Whenever it appeared to demand a restatement they adopted an anti-dialectical attitude.

Another coterie of conservative writers, the anti-dialectical realists, which included early critics of Berengar, like Ascelin and Adelmann, adopted an attitude similar to that of the

Eusebian Conservatives in the Arian controversy.[1] They did not follow in the steps of the great leaders of orthodox thought. They would have no assistance whatever from dialectics. They represented the tone of the older monastic schools. Yet, while they refused to make use of the watchwords of 'Athanasius,' they did not condemn 'Arius.' No attack upon Berengar appears in their writings, save in the letter of Wolfelm, and reports about Peter Damiani indicate that they possessed some sympathy with his ideals.

The cause of this phenomenon lies away back in the conditions of the Carolingian interpretation of eucharistic doctrine. We have seen that two strains of interpretation were in vogue in that era. In the schools the Augustinian tradition was strongly upheld, but behind the sacramentaries and the Mass-cultus the realism of Ambrose was in operation. The doctrine of Radbert constituted an attempt at once to develop and to purify the Ambrosian tradition from its grosser manifestations, yet these aims did not check the revival of Augustinianism in the teaching of Ratramn, inspired by the Neo-Platonism of John the Scot. The controversy of the ninth century left the question unsettled. Contemporaries of Paschasius and Ratramn were content to adopt elements from the teaching of both writers. This was indeed no more than a continuance of the method of pre-Carolingian theology, and it was the method adopted by the anti-dialectic writers of Berengar's time. If they supported the Ambrosian realism of Lanfranc and Guitmund, Berengar was so faithful an adherent of Augustine, that, with one exception, they avoided direct attack upon him; and if they rejected the use of dialectics, which the protagonists on both sides of the controversy adopted, they confined their disapproval to a refusal to sanction the introduction of dialectics into the curriculum of the schools, without expressly attacking those who made use of it.

No better representative of the conservative anti-dialecticians can be found than Peter Damiani. Damiani was a critic not only of the educational methods of the day,[2] but of the worldly ambitions of the great bishops. Thus the professional efficiency of Lanfranc as well as his educational policy was likely to rouse the antipathy of Damiani. Damiani's mystical temperament was unable to appreciate the determined methods of the ecclesiastics of Lanfranc's circle, who realised that the reform of clerical life and learning could only be secured by a strong and efficient episcopate. Damiani centred all his hopes on the reform of the Papacy.[1] Thus there are antecedent grounds for the vindication of the report that Damiani favoured Berengar against Lanfranc,[2] and the blameless and self-effacing public life of Berengar, especially his devotion to the ideals of hermit-life, were bound to win sympathy from Damiani, who spent much of his time in advocating the eremitical life,[3] although without weakening in his support of the current policy for the reform of cenobitic life.

---

[1] Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, p. 41 ff.

[2] Endres, *Beiträge*, viii. 10 ff. Neukirch, p. 32 f., attempts to prove that he desired the introduction of philosophy into the curriculum of the

Both strands of Carolingian eucharistic teaching are represented in Damiani's writings, although he lays greater stress upon Ambrosian realism.[4] The eucharistic body is the true body of the Lord,[5] in contrast with the symbol (umbra) of the Old Testament shew-bread. The Eucharist is a 'mystery of terror,' from the Lord's body flames beat on the breast of the officiant.[6] The mouth of the receiver is red with the body of the Lord.[7] If necessary the Lord's body can become visible through the aid of a miracle ; and to convince a doubting priest, actual flesh can appear in his hands, so that his fingers become red with the blood.[8] If poured from a

---

schools, but Damiani's efforts were confined to the attempt to remedy the illiteracy of the clergy. He criticised their inability to read and write.

[1] Neukirch, p. 51, etc.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 58, and Endres, pp. 10, 17, deny that Damiani took an active part in the controversy.

[3] Neukirch, p. 16 ff.

[4] Damiani wrote no treatise on the Eucharist. The *Expositio Canonis Missae* (Migne, 145, 879–892) was formerly assigned to him. *Cf.* Neukirch, p. 58 n. 2 ; Schnitzer, p. 396 (doubtfully) ; Gore, *The Body of Christ* (1901), p. 116 n. 2 ; Darwell Stone, i. 260 n. 3. Herzog, *Realencyklopädie*, xx. 56 ff., and Endres, p. 10 n. 1, did not altogether dismiss the possibility of Damiani's authorship. But it belongs to the very end of the twelfth or the beginning of the thirteenth century. De Ghellinck dates it about 1200. *Cf. infra*, p. 402 n. 1. Geiselmann, pp. 396–400, makes no reference to it, as it falls outside his period.

[5] Migne, 145, 393c.

[6] *Ibid.* 656b.

[7] *Ibid.* 144, 278a.

[8] *Ibid.* 145, 573c.

chalice into a marble basin the blood of the Lord stains the part which it touches.[1] He who touches the Lord's body with impure hands crucifies Him again.[2]

The sacramental process consists of a change of the bread and wine into the sacrament of the body and blood.[3] But his only explanation of the change is an appeal to miracles.[4] For ordinary occasions the actual body and blood remain invisible beneath the species of bread and wine.[5]

This is the popular eucharistic terminology of Carolingian times, reinforced by the mystic realism of Damiani's temperament and assisted by the vivid phraseology of the popular preacher, a feature reminiscent of Chrysostom's teaching. It illustrates the extent to which the earlier teaching was prevalent in the eleventh century. Its significance is not to be overestimated when dogmatic intention is under consideration. It is relieved by another aspect of Damiani's teaching. The body of the Lord, the sacrificial gift, which is dedicated on the altar through the office of the priest, receives the power of the Spirit, and thereby gives life and sanctifies. This vivifying virtue in the elements can only be received from the Holy Spirit, who actually fills them with His grace. If the Holy Spirit is not there, the element is not the body of the Lord, but simply bread.[6] Yet this doctrine of an infusion of spiritual grace, which makes the elements dynamically effective in an Augustinian sense, is not correlated by Damiani with his conception of the real presence of the body of Christ. Like the writers of the previous generation, he did not think out his statements to a conclusion.

In a letter addressed by Wolfelm of Brauweiler to Meginhard, Abbot of Gladbach,[7] the writer attacks a statement which he attributes to Berengar, that as the resurrection body of Christ could not pass through closed doors, it could not be actually present in the Eucharist. Wolfelm appeals to the Gospel of S. John for proof that after the Resurrection Jesus appeared to His disciples after passing through closed doors.[8] The words of institution, uttered by Him who created all things by a mere verbal command, prove the actuality of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, although they still remain mysteries.[1] God's word cannot remain without effect, especially as God the Creator and God the Redeemer are the same. That which the Redeemer wills must be fulfilled as inevitably as that which the Creator orders.[2] To the authority of the Old and New Testaments Berengar attempts to add a third, when he says that if a mouse eats a piece of the consecrated element, Christ does not remain in it. This is the sort of folly which Horace rebuked when he said 'The mountain travailed and brought forth a mouse.' We thought Berengar was placed above the mountains, and would produce something great, but all he can do is to bring forth a trifling thing of this kind.[3] If the body of Christ, although eaten by the elect, returns to heaven and is not impaired in its entirety, how much less will it be impaired if reprobate men and even a mouse consume the elements, even as the sun, which sends its rays into the noisome places of this world, withdraws them again to itself without pollution. S. Andrew, according to the Church of Achaia, taught that although the flesh and blood of the Lamb were sacrificed and consumed, yet the Lamb remained whole and alive.[4] But Wolfelm ends by conceding Berengar's point by maintaining that there is a difference between worthy and unworthy reception. Christ remains in the former case in the recipient, but not in the latter.[5] Wolfelm emphasises the necessity of perceiving with the eye of the mind, and complains that Berengar made use of the eye of the body only.[6] Wolfelm does not discuss the character of the sacramental presence. Chronologically he belonged to the anti-dialectic writers of the second half of the century, yet his inquiry does not advance beyond that of similar writers in the period which closed with Durand of Troarn, but the question of the relation of the eucharistic content to unworthy recipients, and of cases where an accident caused its consumption by animals, was much discussed in later stages of the controversy.[7]

---

[1] Migne, 145, 712c.
[2] *Ibid.* 501d.
[3] *Ibid.* 144, 553d.
[4] *Ibid.* 145, 573a–b.
[5] *Ibid.* 712b.
[6] *Ibid.* 110d.
[7] *Ibid.* 154, 412–414; *Mon. Ger. SS.*, xii. 185 ff.
[8] Migne, 154, 412d. *Cf. supra*, p. 217.

The challenge of Wolfelm was taken up by Manegold of Lautenbach, who directed a treatise against the Abbot of

---

[1] Migne, 154, 413b. [2] *Ibid.* 413c. [3] *Ibid.* 413d. [4] *Ibid.* 414b.
[5] *Ibid.* 414a, c. [6] *Ibid.* 413b. [7] *Cf.* Geiselmann, p. 404.

Brauweiler. The body of the Lord was immortal and indestructible before the Resurrection, and by virtue of divine power it was this body which He gave to His disciples. This He did lest the believers should think that the grace imparted to them was due to His bodily withdrawal into heaven. Just as His physical condition was no hindrance to the reception by the disciples of His immortal and indestructible body, so now His withdrawal to heaven is no hindrance to the reception of the body received from the Virgin.[1]

The process of the sacrament is the work of the invisible priest. As in Baptism the minister is only the external instrument, while One is standing in the midst whom the believer sees but whom the unbeliever does not recognise, who really performs the act of Baptism and causes the effect of salvation, so while in the Eucharist the priest utters the life-giving and sanctifying words, yet the invisible Priest changes and sanctifies the elements,[2] so that the worshipper receives, as Ambrose taught, not what nature forms, but what blessing consecrates.

But the chief object of Manegold's short treatise was the confutation of the Berengarian doctrine, although he does not nominally attack its author. We are refreshed at the Lord's Table not by the symbolical but by the actual body of the Lord.[3] The use of the phrase ' Lord's Table ' appears to have been inspired by Berengarian terminology. Even though it is a table and not an altar, Manegold argues that the body—the food—is none the less real. The remains of the anti-dialectic writers[4] show how few standpoints of defence against Berengar's criticism they possessed without recourse to Berengar's own weapons. Without the aid of dialectics, the metabolic realism would soon have come to the end of its resources.

The Augustinian tradition comes to the surface again in the *Dialogue* of Otloh, a monk of S. Emmeran in Ratisbon, who died at Fulda about 1070.[1] Otloh declined the aid of dialectical reasoning,[2] but made a curious use of dialectical terms in an attempt to arrive at the mystical sense lying behind ordinary language.[3] Disregarding the conclusions of formal logic, he presents his own definition of substance and accidence. Objects which come within human experience consist of elements (elementa) and things (res).[4] The elements consist of everything which, as corporal substance, mankind uses.[5] A thing does not exist as a special substance, but as the accidence of a special substance,[6] such as day and night, number, weariness, medicine, plenty, and scarcity.[7] Yet he does not appear to have included all that pertains to a ' thing ' in its accidentals,[8] and he is aware that some thinkers use the term ' substance ' for his interpretation of ' res.'[9] In this confusion of terms and categories Otloh seems to equate elements with matter, and substance with form or special existence (aliquid substantia), while his use of accidence is confined to certain categories, such as number and size, without including form. So he is able to define ' things ' of this kind as natural mysteries.[10]

---

[1] Migne, 155, 166a. [2] *Ibid.* 166b. [3] *Ibid.* 166a.

[4] *Cf.* also Jotsaud, Chancellor of Cluny and Abbot of S. Claude (1052) (Migne, 147, 897; Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. i. 632), and Ruthard, Abbot of Corvey (1046), then of Hersfeld (1074) (Mabillon, *Acta*, vi. pt. ii. 138; *Annales*, iv. 478, 527, 597). The latter wrote a treatise on the Eucharist which does not appear in Migne's collection. Cf. *Écrivains de l'Ordre de Saint Benoît*, ii. (1717) 539.

Another kind of ' things ' consists of the mysteries of the divine dispensation, comprising the Incarnation, Passion, and Resurrection of the Lord.[11] These two definitions of ' thing ' Otloh applies to the elucidation of eucharistic teaching, and obtains thereby a third kind of ' things '—the elements used in consecration, oil, salt, water, baptismal water, and the eucharistic elements.[12] Through consecration the nature mysteries are brought into relationship with the divine dispensational mysteries. The eucharistic elements have the same symbolism as the corresponding elements in their natural condition.[1] The bread and wine which feed the outer man are the fittest symbols of that which feeds the inner man.[2] The application by Christ to His Person of the terms 'bread' and 'wine' signified that by which the inner man is strengthened and that which he enjoys. The mixing of wine and water in the sacrifice is symbolical. The mystery of the Lord's blood repeats the process of the Cross.[3]

---

[1] Chevalier gives November 23, 1072–73.

[2] Migne, 146, 103a : ' omnia licet juxta dialecticae artis subtilitatem distinguere nequeam, non enim merui illius habere notitiam, si tamen sententia juxta morem sacrae Scripturae aliquatenus proferatur, peto ne propter rusticitatem sermonis respuatur, cum constet plurimos ecclesiasticos scriptores parum excoluisse dialecticam, etiamsi noverint illam.'

[3] *Ibid.* 102b–d, 103b. [4] *Ibid.* 102a. [5] *Ibid.* 102a.

[6] *Ibid.* 102d : ' Res autem reor aliquo modo posse dici omnia, quae non per substantiam propriam existunt, ut elementa, sed alicui substantiae accidentia intellectu. . . .'

[7] *Ibid.* 103a. [8] *Cf.* Endres, *Beiträge*, xvii. Heft. 2–3, 77.

[9] Migne, 146, 103b : ' quam plurimi una pro substantia, una pro accidentibus ponunt.'

[10] *Ibid.* 127d. [11] *Ibid.* 101d. [12] *Ibid.* 127c.

The consecrated elements do not remain solely mystical, for they receive from consecration the power of effecting salvation.[4] If they are mystical symbols they produce a dynamic effect upon the recipient. The medium which creates this capacity in the elements is the appeal to the divine name or the repetition of the Lord's words. As without the appeal to the Trinity in Baptism, no new-birth and no forgiveness of sins takes place, so without the words of institution there is no transfiguration of the bread and wine into the life-giving mystery of the Lord's body and blood.[5] By this process of the sacrament the elements are absorbed into a mystery, the bread and wine are transfigured into the life-giving body and blood of the Lord.[6]

There is a distinction between the Eucharist and other mysteries of this kind. The latter are only spiritual so far as they are consecrated in a spiritual manner, and are received by faith only; but the Eucharist is a living and life-giving mystery.[7] The difference between the two is that which exists between an actual body and its figure.[8] So the Eucharist is a singular mystery.[9] While other mysteries only possess saving-grace for those who receive them, the Eucharist is not only a saving-grace for those who consecrate and receive it, but for all believers, whether living or dead. The departed receive mitigation from it. Only Baptism can be compared with it. As in Baptism a man receives new birth in Christ, so in the Eucharist he is refreshed with His body lest he die on the road when absent from home, when, by virtue of a union through faith and communion, he may be one with Christ.[1]

---

[1] Migne, 146, 129a.

[2] *Ibid.*: 'aptissime illius figuram exprimunt.'

[3] *Ibid.* 129b.

[4] *Ibid.* 127d: 'non solum mystica, sed etiam salutaria et sancta esse creduntur.'

[5] *Ibid.* 128a–b.

[6] *Ibid.* 128c: 'elementa in mysterium assumpta.' 128b: 'panis et vini sacrificia in corporis et sanguinis Domini mysteria vivifica transfigurari.'

[7] *Ibid.* 128c: 'vitalia vel vivifica.'

[8] *Ibid.*: 'quanta inter verum corpus et umbram ejus imaginariam constat distantia.'

[9] *Ibid.* 128d: 'mysterium singulare.'

Apart from the system of Berengar, no stronger testimony could be produced to the strength of the Augustinian tradition existing in the eleventh century. Berengar's was not a voice crying in the wilderness. It is possible that the four sections of Berengarian thought described by Guitmund [2] represented independent developments of Augustinian doctrine, and, if so, there can be no doubt that their activity was quickened by Berengar, and the work of Otloh shows that away in Germany the old dynamic-symbolism was still vocal. Possibly the teaching of Otloh inspired the complaint of Theoduin [3] that the influence of Berengar was rampant in Germany, and if his system also possesses elements of the Ambrosian realism, its independence is shown by his attempt to establish an anti-dialectical description or definition of substance and accidence. If he uses realist expressions such as the contrast between body and figure, and if he adopts the Ambrosian term 'transfigurare,' these expressions are not allowed to run into contradiction with his own dynamic-symbolism. It was the attitude of the old Carolingian Augustinian school, and stands in contrast with that of Berengar chiefly in its refusal to criticise the positive realism of contemporaries.[4]

Among the anti-dialectic writings of the second half of the century the pseudo-*Confessio Fidei* of Alcuin should be included. This document, which appeared in this period, is a réchauffé of the *Expositio Fidei* of Florus of Lyons.[5] It teaches that the eucharistic body is true flesh and true blood.[6] The eucharistic body is not subject to natural law, for it was born of the Virgin, walked on the sea, supplied food for the five thousand,[1] and passed through closed doors to the disciples. It was not damaged by the latter operation, and so His flesh can be eaten without lesion or detriment to itself.[2] A contrast is drawn between faith and reason.[3] Faith must be content with the depth of the mystery.[4] The body and blood are 'made' or 'perfected' out of the elements by the power of the Holy Spirit, and by Christ who is present with the angels.[5] The creatures of bread and wine are 'transformed' into the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ.[6]

---

[1] Migne, 146, 128d.

[2] Hurter, xxxviii. 12 f.

[3] *Supra*, p. 88.

[4] *Cf.* Geiselmann, p. 403.

[5] Migne, 101, 1003–1098; Geiselmann, *Studien*, pp. 51–97; F. Cabrol, *Rev. d'Hist. ecclés.*, xix. pt. i. (October 1923) 518 f. Cabrol, following Dom Cagin [quoting *Mélanges Cabrières*, i. (1899) 231, 265 f., and Cardinal Mai, *Script. vet. nova collectio*, iii. (1828) pt. ii. 247 f.], says that the *Confessio* is an adaptation of the Ten Categories of Aristotle.

[6] Migne, 101, 1089b, d, 1090b.

The *Confessio* is written in a more polemical tone than other anti-dialectical writings. The phraseology of one passage suggests that it was directed against heretical teaching.[7] It is quoted for the first time by Abbot John in a letter to the Empress Agnes (d. 1077), widow of Henry III of Germany,[8] and Geiselmann regards it as an anti-Berengarian treatise.

---

[1] Migne, 101, 1090c. These statements prove that it was not written before Berengar's time (Geiselmann, *Studien*, pp. 78–82).

[2] Migne, 101, 1090b.

[3] *Ibid.* 1090a.

[4] *Ibid.* 1087a: 'mysterii profunditate.' *Cf.* 1088d.

[5] *Ibid.* 1087c–d, 1088a–c.

[6] *Ibid.* 1088c: 'Panis et vini creatura in sacramentum carnis transfertur.'

[7] *Ibid.* 1087a.

[8] Geiselmann, *Studien*, p. 94.

CHAPTER XVIII

GUITMUND OF AVERSA

TOGETHER with Lanfranc, Guitmund of Aversa conducted the chief dialectical defence of realist doctrine in the early Middle Ages.[1] Like Lanfranc, he emphasised faith rather than reason, but his strictures against the use of reason are less severe than those of his predecessor, and he does not make any specific attack on dialectics as a science. He begins his treatise *De Corporis et Sanguinis Christi Veritate*[2] by noting that all sections of Berengarian opinion are agreed that the accidence of bread and wine remains after consecration,[3] and this doctrine he proceeds to demolish. By making this denial, the Berengarians leave out of account the will of God, for, according to the Psalmist, God can do anything that He wills, and if God is almighty He can will a change to take place in natural objects. To deny this necessity is to assert that He is not almighty, which would mean that He is not truly God. As the faithful believe in God, they must accept the statement that He can do whatever He wills.[4]

Guitmund states the metabolism of realism in clearer terms than any predecessor had ventured to use. The 'essentialiter mutari' of Lanfranc is developed by Guitmund into 'substantialiter transmutari.'[1] If all the varied objects of nature were developed by God out of nothing, how can the nature of bread and wine, which already exists, resist being changed (transferatur) by the will of God? Berengar must admit from his knowledge of medicine that the bread or wine which we daily consume is transformed (transformatur) into the flesh or blood of our bodies. Then why cannot God, by the majesty of His presence and the power of His word, if He wishes, change (transformat) the bread and wine of the Eucharist into flesh and blood? Even Plato said that the nature of things is what God wills.[2]

---

[1] Grabmann, i. 225, emphasises Guitmund's skill in dialectics.

[2] Hurter, *Sanctorum Patrum Opuscula Selecta*, xxxviii.; Migne, 149, 1427–1494.

[3] Several passages (Hurter, xxxviii. 38, 97, 101, 109, 113, etc.) suggest, *prima facie*, acquaintance with the *D.S.C.* of Berengar, *i.e.* Hurter p. 38 = *D.S.C.* p. 163; 97 = 258; 101 = 258 (*cf.* 234); 109 = 157 f., 197 f.; 113 = 277. But Hurter pp. 38 and 101 also appear in the 'Epis. of Berengar to Adelmann' (Martène and Durand, iv. 111e, 111b); Hurter p. 109 occurs in the *Opusculum* (Migne, 150, 426d); and Hurter p. 113 is discussed by Ascelin (Migne, 150, 67c). So Guitmund need not, and probably did not, use the *D.S.C.* If we could conclude that Guitmund had seen the *D.S.C.*, we should have confirmation for the date of Berengar's book, which has been assigned to 1068–70 (*supra*, p. 162 n. 1), for Guitmund's book was written 1073–78. It is possible that Abelard had seen Berengar's work. In *Sic et Non* (Migne, 178, 1529c) he quotes three passages quoted by Berengar (*D.S.C.*, p. 269) and also confuses Jerome with Origen.

[4] Hurter, xxxviii. 14, 40 f., 50 f.

The fundamental objection to the doctrine of a change of essence lies in the contention that such a transformation does not take place in nature, and Guitmund admits that when any material thing is changed in substance (substantialiter . . . transformatur) into something else, it is transformed into something which did not previously exist, as when the rod of Moses was changed into a serpent, but the bread is changed into the body of Christ which already exists.[3] The change does not create the body of Christ, and Guitmund finally disposed of the Radbertian theory of the new creation of the eucharistic body at each celebration.[4]

Like Berengar, he appeals to the Ambrosian statement 'they are what they were and are changed into other,' but whereas Berengar stressed the first part of the passage, Guitmund makes use of the second, and twists the statement to mean 'that they may not be in themselves, but are changed into other things.'[5] Through the change the bread becomes the body of Christ. That which does not exist cannot come within the category of 'becoming.' He draws a contrast between phenomenal existence and pure 'being.' 'To become' belongs to the category of being and refers to what already is, so that when it 'comes into existence' it cannot be said 'to become' or to begin to be. An original creation was antecedent to coming into existence or appearance among phenomena. It is not a question between 'being' and 'not being,' but between something which already 'is' and then 'becomes' something else. How does that which was first created 'become' something? By the word of God. That which did not lack a beginning could not become anything else save by 'becoming.'[1] The Arianism of this argumentation, when applied to the body of Christ, entirely escaped Guitmund's notice.

---

[1] Hurter, xxxviii. 38. [2] *Ibid.* 15, 27. [3] *Ibid.* 38, 112.

[4] *Cf.* Geiselmann, pp. 385, 395.

[5] Hurter, xxxviii. 153 f.: 'ut non in se sint, sed in aliud commutentur.' *Cf. supra*, p. 325 n. 2.

Scripture mentions four methods by which a man comes into existence. Firstly, the case of Adam, who was made from the earth; secondly, the normal process of procreation; thirdly, the creation of Eve, a virgin woman from a virgin man; fourthly, the reverse process, a man from a woman, the virgin Christ from a virgin. The second and most usual of these processes, at which no one marvels, is none the less wonderful.[2] But the most wonderful of all, the Virgin-birth, people attempt to contradict and refuse;[3] although it is really less singular than the second and third processes, and is similar to the first.[4]

So also sacred writings mention four kinds of substantive change or effectiveness:[5] one by which all things are created from nothing; another by which all things return to nothing—although we have no experience of it;[6] a third in which substances change, by nature or miracle, into other substances, as the nut into the tree, a seed into a herb, food and drink into flesh and blood, or a serpent into a rod;[7] a fourth by which that which 'is' changes into that which no less is, as when the bread and wine are changed into the body and blood of Christ,[8] a process which most resembles the first and is more credible than the second or third,[9] and is analogous to the Incarnation.[10] The bread and wine of the altar of the Lord are substantially changed into the body and blood of Christ.[11]

---

[1] Hurter, xxxviii. 39. [2] *Ibid.* 43. [3] *Ibid.* 44.

[4] *Ibid.* 45. He appears to follow the classification of Ratramn. *Cf.* Nägle, p. 310.

[5] Hurter, xxxviii. 46: 'rerum mutationes substantivas sive efficientias.'

[6] *Ibid.* 47. [7] *Ibid.* 48. [8] *Ibid.* 48 f.

[9] *Ibid.* 49. [10] *Ibid.* 50.

[11] *Ibid.* 169: 'Sed panem et vinum altaris Domini in corpus et sanguinem Christi substantialiter commutari.'

The body and blood are not bread and wine.[1] The whole of the elements are changed, not, as some allege, part changed into body or blood, while part remains bread or wine, with the object of protecting the body and blood against unworthy recipients.[2] The agent of the change is the word of Christ pronounced in the blessing of the priest.[3]

If Lanfranc had established the theory of Transubstantiation by his doctrine of a change of essence, Guitmund reinforces the doctrine with the terminology of Transubstantiation, although the actual word was probably not yet coined.[4] It is significant that his term 'substantialiter' appeared in the formula offered to Berengar in 1079. Henceforth the description of the change as taking place 'essentialiter' was abandoned by most orthodox writers, probably on account of its physical associations. The theory of a 'substantial' change raised the doctrine to a more philosophical plane, but the idea was the same. A substantial change is a real change, obliterating the substances of bread and wine, transferring them into the substances of body and blood.

Yet Guitmund, like Lanfranc, could not escape the fundamental contradiction involved in the theory of Transubstantiation. If a thing is changed in substance it ceases to be what it was. If it has not ceased to be what it was, it is not changed. In discussing the third mode of substantive change,[5] he says that although this kind of change does not come within our experience, it is conceivable to reason, for when specific accidents are displaced by others, the only thing that can be said is that they cease to be. A thing so far as it exists, exists in substance. But when the contrary (accidents ?) supervene, it cannot exist in its substance, nor pass over into another substance. So it altogether ceases to be, unless one describes the process of displacement as a transformation. There are indeed numerous examples of things which are essentially changed into other things which exist in a similar condition, for example, when a white parchment is covered with black ink. Thus we can speak of a withdrawal of the accidence, so that a thing becomes nothing; or of a change into the approaching accidence, which does not illustrate our case so well—in every instance things are changed into other things which already exist.[1]

---

[1] Hurter, xxxviii. 111.

[2] *Ibid.* 176 ff.

[3] *Ibid.* 155 f.

[4] *Infra*, p. 401 f.

[5] Hurter, xxxviii. 47. *Cf. supra*, p. 343.

This statement admits Berengar's contention that accidence and substance are inseparable, especially as Guitmund allows that flavour and colour and other accidents remain when the substances are changed.[2] Although asserting that a thing exists by virtue of its substance, he grants that if its accidents are displaced it either ceases to exist or becomes something else. Conversely, if the accidents remain, the substance remains, so that Berengar's argument, that because of the existence of the accidents of bread and wine in the Eucharist the substance of the same must also be there, remains valid. Guitmund tries to overcome the difficulty by postulating a fourth kind of change, in addition to that put forward in the passage from the pseudo-Augustinian work on the unity of the Trinity against Felicianus, on which he is commenting—namely, a change from one thing into another which already exists, as of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. This is a process which the Lord reserves for Himself, and it stands in the same category with the Incarnation.[3] But, we may ask, what then becomes of the accidence of bread and wine which falls within Guitmund's third category? He merges his proof in its objective. He uses the object as an illustration of itself, and shirking the difficulty lying in his third example, from which alone an illustration for his case would have been valid, he ends by arguing in a circle in his fourth example, which is merely arbitrarily brought forward. He attempts to overcome the difficulty by urging that the sacramental change is concerned with two things, while the other three types are concerned only with one.[1] In other words, he endeavours to unite two categories. The argument represents the breakdown of metabolic-realism when it attempts to find an explanation in the two-nature doctrine. The argument of Lanfranc was really sounder. Substance and accidence can be separated. To this Guitmund would have agreed, but he vitiates it by limiting it to the sacramental process.

---

[1] Hurter, xxxviii. 47 f.: 'Quamvis de accidentibus singulis, quae supervenientibus aliis cedunt, non appareat vere posse aliud dici quam quod omnino nihil fiunt. Nam si aliquid essent, in subjecto essent. Sed contrariis supervenientibus, nec in suo possunt remanere subjecto, nec ad alia transmeare. Omnino igitur nihil fiunt, nisi quis forte illa dicat in ea quae superveniunt transmutari. Quod si ita est, innumera nobis exempla occurrent earum rerum, quae essentialiter in ea, quae similiter existunt, transmutantur. . . . Unde fit ut accidentia recedentia, sicut diximus, aut penitus nihil fiant, aut, si permutantur, in advenientia, quod nostrae causae non parum accederet, in ea utique multoties permutentur, quae jam erant.'

[2] *Ibid.* 149; *cf.* 64. Geiselmann, p. 392, points out that Guitmund has not worked out in principle the relation of accidence to sacramental substance. He represents them as a unity, in which the accidence is the expression and form of the substance ('er beide als Einheit beurteilt, die Akzidentien als Ausdruck und Erscheinung der Substanz').

[3] Hurter, xxxviii. 50.

On the other hand, Guitmund's theory of the sacramental content is a definition of realism in the clearest terms. In Book III he presents his own positive statement of the doctrine of the real presence. He begins with a proof of the proposition that we eat the true body of Christ in its substance, not in the Berengarian symbol.[2] At the words of institution Christ bore Himself in His own hands, and, as Augustine pointed out, this is the explanation of the saying that David was borne in his hands before Abimelech, a passage which cannot be taken literally, but which refers to Christ.[3] Yet the words 'This is my body' are to be taken literally and not figuratively,[4] meaning that Christ bore the substance of His body.[5] Guitmund reverses Berengar's interpretation of 'This,' as referring to the substance of bread. Grammarians and dialecticians show that pronouns need not always refer to substance. So when Christ said 'This,' He did not mean the substance of bread, but the qualities [6] of the eucharistic substance which appear in the form of bread. 'This' has a demonstrative, not a relative significance in the passage.[7] Several other examples are given by Augustine which prove that the true body is present.[8] The Ambrosian *De Sacramentis* also teaches that it is the true flesh and blood which we receive,[9] and this teaching is supported by Leo the Great, Cyril of Alexandria,[10] Gregory the Great, Jerome,

---

[1] Hurter, xxxviii. 49.

[2] *Ibid.* 118: 'quod corpus Christi verum in substantia sua, non in umbra berengariana comedimus, approbemus.'

[3] *Ibid.* 118.

[4] *Ibid.* 119: 'non figurative, sed substantive.'

[5] *Ibid.* 121.

[6] *Ibid.* 101 ff.

[7] *Ibid.* 111.

[8] *Ibid.* 122 f.

[9] *Ibid.* 124 f.

[10] *Ibid.* 128 f.

Isidore, Bede, and all the Latin and Greek doctors;[1] and by Hilary especially.[2] From the teaching of Hilary Guitmund concludes that as the Father is naturally or substantially in the Son,[3] so when we receive this food we receive the substance of Christ,[4] not in any symbolical[5] or qualitative sense.[6]

Yet the sacramental process, although changing the bread into the substantial body of Christ, does not involve a change into actual flesh—that is to say, it has not the appearance of flesh.[7] The bread passes into the divine flesh which already exists, difficult though such a process may be to understand.[8] So he is able to embody the old Radbertian contradiction that the eucharistic flesh is that which Christ received from the Virgin, although not in its form or appearance.[9]

A similar contradiction arises in his discussion of the statement that the body of Christ can be broken into parts and ground with the teeth. The body which could be touched by S. Thomas and the holy women after the Resurrection is tangible and fragible in the Eucharist. If this is denied, not on the ground of impossibility, but because the statement seems to offer indignity to Christ, it must be remembered that He who did not disdain the scourging, the crown of thorns, the nails and the lance, does not scorn to be ground by the teeth of the faithful.[10] The hands are less pure than the teeth, for they touch many things which the teeth never touch, yet they have touched the Lord's body. If it is Christ's will that His body should be distributed in fragments, no one should see anything unbefitting in that.[11]

However, there is no actual breaking or grinding of the body. The idea only arises from the similitude of breaking the elements.[12] We must not believe that His venerable body is divided among many. He is as completely in one little portion (' portiuncula,' the Berengarian term) as in the whole host. We ought not to speak of many particles, but of one host, whole and undivided, although by the office of the priest it seems to be divided. So with the teeth, if in any way the body seems to be broken, we do not understand it to be broken.[1] If we conceded that it could be divided into parts, there might be some justification for the objection of the adversaries that the body of Christ would have to be as big as a mountain to meet all the demands made upon it.[2] Although the host is divided into three parts, it does not follow that three bodies are present. We must speak not of three parts, but of one host,[3] and each person who receives, takes the whole body of Christ.[4] While the body of Christ is present on a thousand altars at the same time, yet it remains in heaven, just as the thought of our minds, when clothed in words, becomes audible as a whole to each of a thousand people, and yet remains intact in the mind of the speaker. So also, as Augustine says, the human soul exists as a whole in each several part of the human body.[5]

---

[1] Hurter, xxxviii. 130 ff. [2] *Ibid.* 132 ff. [3] *Ibid.* 136 f.

[4] *Ibid.* 141: 'substantiam Christi sumimus . . . quia Christus in nobis substantialiter est.' *Cf.* 125.

[5] *Ibid.* 142: 'non umbram et figuram tantum.' *Cf.* 121.

[6] *Confessio* (Migne, 149, 1500d).

[7] Hurter, xxxviii. 98. [8] *Ibid.* 38. [9] *Ibid.* 98, 123.

[10] *Ibid.* 17, 151. [11] *Ibid.* 19.

[12] *Ibid.* 21: 'propter similitudinem fractionis.' *Cf.* 82.

Guitmund was the first writer to discuss at length Berengar's criticism that the realist theory broke up the body of Christ into parts and necessitated its presence in many places at once. He unfolds the idea that the body of Christ is not only present as a whole in each several particle of the host, but that it is everywhere present at once. The latter problem had been noticed by Radbert and was described by Lanfranc as an incomprehensible mystery.[6]

As the body of Christ is indivisible, so it can suffer no corruption or dissolution.[7] If the consecrated host is consumed by an animal or by fire, the body is preserved. He who did not shun walking on the earth, or lying in a stone tomb, does not abhor being consumed by an animal. A certain decree sanctions the burning of the host on certain occasions in order to preserve it from misuse,[8] but only the accidents suffer the dissolution proper to their nature.[9] When necessary a miracle can intervene to save the body of Christ from harm, as when the martyr Tarsitius,[1] while carrying the sacrament, was surrounded by pagans demanding to be shown that which he was carrying. On his refusal they killed him, and found an empty linen veil.[2] Guitmund reports that his master Lanfranc used to tell a story of his boyhood in Italy, when on one occasion a priest found actual flesh on the altar and blood in the chalice. He reported the wonder to the bishop, who consulted other bishops, and then sealed up the flesh and blood and placed the phial in the middle of the altar to be preserved for ever.[3]

---

[1] Hurter, xxxviii. 22; *cf.* 68, 82. The idea appeared first in the *De Paschate* and *De Eucharistia* of Eutychius of Constantinople (d. 582) (Migne, *P.G.*, 86, ii. 2393c). *Cf.* Steitz, xii. 214.

[2] Hurter, xxxviii. 65.

[3] *Ibid.* 22.

[4] *Ibid.* 24.

[5] *Ibid.* 25 f., 29, and Migne, 149, 1500b.

[6] Geiselmann, p. 395.

[7] Hurter, xxxviii. 54, 58.

[8] Schnitzer, p. 359 n. 2, wrongly interprets these passages as an indication that Guitmund taught that the consecrated elements, like the sacramental content, could not be destroyed.

[9] Hurter, xxxviii. 64.

Guitmund's theory of the sacrament is an attempt to combine his own conception of realism with the Augustinian sacramental idea. The body of Christ is substantially present in the Eucharist, which is not a mere sign or figure.[4] The symbol, he says, in the Augustinian sense is the consecrated element, and in all ecclesiastical authorities, and in the missal, 'the bread of the altar is called a sacrament, that is a sacred sign,'[5] but it is not a sign of the body, but a sign of the Passion of Christ. We do not kill Christ again in the celebration of the Lord's body and blood, but we commemorate His death and so signify the Passion, and when Christ is said to be sacrificed, no carnal interpretation is to be put upon the statement.[6] This misconception caused some to desert Jesus when He spoke to them of eating His flesh.[7] Augustine says that Christ used these words figuratively, but Augustine's meaning is difficult to grasp. In any case it cannot refer to the body of the Lord, but to His Passion, so that we may imitate Christ and communicate with Him by sharing in His Passion. By 'figure' Augustine means not sacramental presence, but the sacramental act, the celebration of the body and blood of Christ. So Berengar's appeal to Augustine's work, *On Christian Doctrine*, fails, because Augustine never uses the terms 'sign' and 'figure' of the real content of the sacrament.[8] Symbolism is concerned not with the Eucharist, but with soteriology, and in this sense the language of the

---

[1] *c.* 257 A.D. Pope Damasus I (361–384) celebrated his martyrdom in verse.

[2] Hurter, xxxviii. 60 f.

[3] *Ibid.* 63.

[4] *Ibid.* 78.

[5] *Ibid.* 76 f.

[6] *Ibid.* 78 ff.

[7] *Ibid.* 81 f.

[8] *Ibid.* 84.

Church calls the Eucharist a sacrament, a sacred sign, and in this sense only can the Berengarian criticism be allowed. When the Berengarians urge the question, ‘ If it is a figure or a sacrament, how can it be the truth ? ’ the reply is that Christ Himself is called a sign in the Scriptures (Luke ii. 34 ; Song of Songs viii. 6 ; Is. xi. 10).[1] Wherefore, although He is a sign, and yet true Christ, it matters not if that which we take from the altar is called a sign, so long as it is the true body of Christ. Of what can Christ be the sign, but of Himself ? He is the sign of our redemption. In a commercial transaction every price is a sign of that which is paid. So Christ is both the price paid for us and the sign of our redemption, and as the food of the altar is effective for our salvation, we believe it to be significative of our salvation.[2]

Commenting on Eph. i. 22, he developed another aspect of sacramental symbolism. Christ’s own body, which is the Church, is the sign, figure, or sacrament of the body which He received from the Virgin. The body of the Church, in the likeness of its Head, is born in the heart by the operation of the Holy Spirit and the virgin Church which is compacted of all races.[3] In Guitmund’s language the Church is thus born of the Church ! He continues—all these things are figured in that which is received from the altar. When the Lord calls bread His body, bread which is formed by the compacting together of many grains of corn, He indicated the faithful who are joined together in unity. So, when He calls the wine His blood, wine which is prepared from many grapes, the union of several members in the Church is signified.[4] Thus Guitmund distinguishes between a proper (proprium) body of Christ, which is the Church, and true (verum) body of Christ, but the Eucharist, he says, is seldom or never called openly a sign of the latter.[5]

The term ‘ mysterium ’ is the equivalent of ‘ sacramentum ’ or ‘ figura,’ and in the summary of his eucharistic belief, which appears in his *Confessio*, he interprets the three terms to mean the mystical body of the faithful. It is a mystery because it contains something mystical ; a sacrament because it hides something sacred within itself which is corporally mediated ; a figure because it represents something else which is spiritual. The mystical and sacred and spiritual is represented (figuratur) through this mystery, because, as we all 'receive corporally the body of Christ, so by living spiritually we ought to be made His body, not that body which the Word of Christ received in His own Person, and which is called dominical (*i.e.* eucharistic), but that which is called in holy Scripture the Church, as S. Paul said in Eph. v.' He is the head and we are the members, and Guitmund repeats the Cyprianic illustration from the union of many grains of corn and many grapes.[1] The twofold conception of the term 'mystery,' combining the idea of the content of the sacrament, or true body of the Lord, and that of the mystical body or the Church, which is united with Him in the sacrament, is a peculiar feature in the teaching of Guitmund.

---

[1] Hurter, xxxviii. 85. [2] *Ibid.* 86. [3] *Ibid.* 89.

[4] *Ibid.* 90 f., 107, 114 ; Migne, 149, 1500c.

[5] Hurter, xxxviii. 91 : ‘ Ipsius vero corporis quo divinitas Salvatoris proprie induta est apud quempiam auctorum, aut nusquam, aut vix signum aperte dici reperies.’ *Cf.* 92.

He defines the 'mystery' as the 'hidden thing' of the sacrament, which has already in turn been defined in his teaching as the 'true body' of the Lord, so that he preserves the ancient Greek notion of the μυστήριον. Yet, like Lanfranc, he attempts to work out a symbolic function [2] for the Eucharist in the Augustinian sense of a sacred sign. If the Eucharist is the true body of the Lord, it is also its sign.[3] Whether the term 'sacrament' or 'figure' be used, it refers to the same thing—the real body of Christ. If Christ is called the splendour of the Father's glory, and the figure of His substance, that does not contradict the fact that He is of the substance of the Father. It is therefore false to say that no figure can be the thing of which it is the figure. So Christ is the sacred sign or sacrament of Himself.[4] He cannot in any sense be a shadow or symbol Himself, so neither can the Eucharist, which is His body, be a symbol.[1] Augustine would not have agreed with Berengar's error that what is received from the altar is only a shadow or figure of the body and blood.[2] In one sense only can the term ' similitude ' be used of the eucharistic content. Although substantially changed, the elements still have the similitude of bread and wine,[3] a statement which suggests the eucharistic symbolism of Lanfranc. On the other hand, the allusion to Christ as a sacrament of Himself not only attempts to embrace the ancient conception of a symbol, but seems to represent a defence of Lanfranc's teaching against Berengar's criticism on this point. Quoting Ambrose, he shows that if the sacraments of the altar were only a shadow or figure of the body of the Lord, they would not be supernatural, as Ambrose proved from the analogy of the Virgin-birth. They would remain in their natural condition.[4] That which is symbolical or figurative necessitates the presence of that which it symbolises. To contradict this statement is equivalent to asserting that a shadow can fall on the wall without the presence of the substance.[5]

---

[1] Cyprian, 'Epis.,' 63, 13.

[2] Geiselmann, p. 376, says that in contrast with Lanfranc, Guitmund holds the Isidorean-Radbertian conception of the sacrament.

[3] Hurter, xxxviii. 85.

[4] *Ibid.* 95 : 'Christus sui ipsius est sacrum signum, id est sacramentum.' *Cf.* Migne, 149, 1500a–b.

Yet Guitmund is driven by the inherent contradiction of the realist interpretation—a contradiction into which even Berengar fell when he attempted to use realist phraseology—to admit that, while the flesh which we receive is the true flesh, we receive it through the ' grace of a figure,' and *not in the substance* of the flesh and blood.[6] Although he twists the testimony of Augustine in order to support his apology for realism, the content of Augustine's language is so explicit that he is compelled to resort to special pleading in order to make it bear the interpretation which he puts upon it. Augustine, he says, was the original cause of the Berengarian heresy,[7] and when Augustine uses the terms ' figure ' and ' sign,' he refers to the celebration or commemoration of Christ's death, not to the sacramental food.[8] In the Epistle to Boniface, Augustine was not thinking of the Eucharist, but of sacraments generally.[1] For example, his words are related rather to the manna or the bread and wine offered by Melchizedek to Abraham. But in his symbolism the food and drink also signify the Society of the Church or the mystical body.[2] When Augustine said that it was a crime to speak of eating His flesh, he only condemned a grossly material interpretation.[3] When Berengar quotes his statement 'You do not eat the body which you see,'[4] the words are to be understood in the light of another passage, in which Augustine says that Christ gives us as food the flesh received from Mary, although in its substance, not in its form.[5] So he speaks of the substance, not of a symbol, of the flesh.[6] Guitmund is certainly justified in claiming that a single passage from Augustine is not to be quoted against the rest of his teaching, yet he commits the same offence himself.

---

[1] Hurter, xxxviii. 95.
[2] *Ibid.* 97 f.
[3] *Ibid.* 112.
[4] *Ibid.* 127.
[5] *Ibid.* 141.
[6] *Ibid.* 126 : ' vera ejus caro est quam sumimus, id est, per gratiam figurationis, non per substantiam carnis ; et de sanguine similiter.'
[7] *Ibid.* 118 : ' quoniam ex beato Augustino scandali pene totius videtur esse principium.'
[8] *Ibid.* 78.

The testimony of our senses is deceptive when we approach the consecrated elements. They are not what they appear to be. Not what the carnal senses perceive, but what Christ wished to be operated is to be believed. It does not follow that if the eye of the flesh is deceived, the eye of the soul can be put out.[7] That which is bitter in flavour to the sick man is often sweet to the healthy, and to the ravenous man sour things seem good. A plain woman is beautiful in the eyes of her lover, although not to other people. A bough thrust into the water seems to be bent.[8] Faith, not sight, must control our attitude to the Eucharist. Though the host appears to be broken, it is not really so. If the sacramental content were visible a miracle would have taken place, but miracles are performed only for unbelievers: the believer is satisfied with a sacrament, for he discerns not with the eye but with the soul. So the Lord Jesus spake of the mystery of faith. There can be no mystery unless the object of faith is hidden.[9] The difficulty of believing should be no hindrance to faith. The great facts of providence and free will are just as difficult for reason to understand.[10] The most rational 'course is to believe humbly.'[11] Thus Guitmund arrives at the position occupied by Lanfranc on the relationship between faith and reason.

---

[1] Hurter, xxxviii. 106.
[2] *Ibid.* 107 f.
[3] *Ibid.* 82.
[4] *Ibid.* 97.
[5] *Ibid.* 98.
[6] *Ibid.* 103.
[7] *Ibid.* 29 f.
[8] *Ibid.* 31 ff.
[9] *Ibid.* 33.
[10] *Ibid.* 39.
[11] *Ibid.* 40.

Our union with Christ can only be conceived in the terms of a substantial union with Him in the Eucharist. It is not a mere union of will. The idea may be stated from the Trinity, as Hilary taught. Christ is naturally (naturaliter) in us, not only through concord of will, but substantially (substantialiter), as the Father is naturally or substantially in Christ.[1]

Guitmund's work reveals the impression made by Berengar's doctrine upon his own age that he denied not only Transubstantiation, whether by means of a substantial or essential change, but also the real presence. Guitmund's book shows that he regarded the statement, that the body of Christ is present in the Eucharist only symbolically,[2] as the characteristic teaching of Berengar. In addition to this doctrine Guitmund described three other types of heretical teaching which, while denying Transubstantiation, admit the real presence in one form or another. Some heretics who were questioned by Guitmund claimed that the theory of impanation was ' the more subtle opinion of Berengar himself,'[3] an opinion to which Guitmund confessed himself to be inclined.[4] But, then, how could he urge that Berengar emphasised a merely symbolical presence ? Moreover, he does not examine the impanation theory until he has disposed of the teaching of Berengar. The ' impanatores,' he says, are they who are ' not able to deny that the substance of the body of Christ is in the dominical food, but not believing that the bread and wine, through the words of the Saviour, are changed into His flesh and blood, and mingling Christ with the bread and wine, by a subtle argument they have founded another heresy '[5]—that of Consubstantiation.[6]

In his criticism of this conception Guitmund says that it is not necessary to postulate the addition of the elements of bread and wine—so he reverses the impanation idea—in order to receive the real body and blood of Christ, and he denies that the hypostatic union of the Incarnation is an illustration of the sacramental union. Taking up the language of the 'Athanasian' Creed, he says that as the reasonable soul and flesh form one body, so God and man are one Christ. But in the Eucharist there is not a union of God-man and bread and wine in one Christ.[1] The words 'This is my body' do not mean 'In this is latent my body.'[2] Nor can the Ambrosian formula, 'they are what they were and are changed into other,' be interpreted in the sense of impanation.[3] These people do not make clear how in the solid body of bread another body may lie.[4]

---

[1] Hurter, xxxviii. 135 ff.

[2] *Ibid.* 12 : ' nihil omnino de corpore et sanguine Domini sacramentis istis inesse sed tantummodo umbras haec et figuras esse.'

[3] *Ibid.* 13.

[4] *Ibid.* 185.

[5] *Ibid.* 148 f.

[6] *Ibid.* 152 : ' companatio ' ; the terms ' impanare ' and ' invinare ' are generally used. *Cf.* 152 f.

The two remaining types of teaching noted by Guitmund are certainly not to be found in Berengar's system. One maintains that the bread and wine are only partly changed. Part of the element is changed into the body or blood of the Lord, the other part remains bread or wine, in order to protect the body and blood from unworthy recipients.[5] The other section admits a complete change of the elements into the body and blood, but contends that if unworthy recipients approach the altar the body and blood revert into the elements of bread and wine.[6] In defence of their view these people allege that on one occasion an angel was seen substituting a piece of coal in the place of the consecrated host, when certain unworthy men approached the Eucharist. Guitmund contends that this theory strikes at the root of the doctrine of Transubstantiation. If the bread remained unchanged for the unworthy, why was it necessary to substitute coal ? The bread might have been given to them. Moreover, if the unworthy received coal, the worthy cannot have received flesh and blood.[7]

The true solution, he says, is that the unworthy eat materially, while the worthy eat spiritually, and Guitmund closes the discussion by emphasising the fact that no one really feels worthy of receiving the body and blood of the Lord, yet the reality of Christ's presence, or of their reception of Him, is not affected,[8] but as he had already given expression to the view that the presence of Christ in the Eucharist does not exist save for those who believe,[1] its reality must at least be qualified by the contingent existence of faith.

---

[1] Hurter, xxxviii. 152.
[2] *Ibid.* 158.
[3] *Ibid.* 153.
[4] *Ibid.* 159.
[5] *Ibid.* 13, 176 ff.
[6] *Ibid.* 13, 176 f.
[7] *Ibid.* 177 f.
[8] *Ibid.* 178 f.

Neither the Canon of the Mass nor the Lord Himself speaks of a part of the host only as the body of the Lord.[2] So there is no retransubstantiation of the body and blood into bread and wine on account of the unworthy, because the body of the Lord is incorruptible and cannot be broken up.[3] The bread and wine of the altar remain whole, and through the divine consecration they are changed substantially into the flesh and blood of Christ, so that for all eternity they remain the flesh and blood of our Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ.[4]

Soon after Guitmund's book was written, if not shortly before, the word 'substantialiter' appears in a small treatise formerly assigned to Haymo, Archbishop of Halberstadt[5] (840–853). The use of this term[6] makes impossible a ninth-century authorship for the treatise. It was probably written either by Haymo, Prior of Hirschau (*c.* 1107), or by Haymo of Telleia, the fellow-pupil of the younger Ascelin. We may also note that the treatise adopts Berengar's distinction between a sign and that which it signifies,[7] and appears to confute Guitmund on this point.[8]

---

[1] Hurter, xxxviii. 71, 73.

[2] *Ibid.* 183 f.

[3] *Ibid.* 184.

[4] *Ibid.* 185.

[5] Geiselmann, *Studien*, pp. 9–37.

[6] Migne, 118, 815c: 'quod substantia illa panis scilicet et vini . . . id est natura panis et vini substantialiter convertantur in aliam substantiam, id est in carnem et sanguinem.' 'Substantialiter converti' = Guitmund's 'substantialiter transmutari,' and does not appear elsewhere before the confession submitted to Berengar in 1079. *Cf.* Geiselmann, *Studien*, p. 33. But Durand had used the term 'substantialiter'; *cf. supra*, p. 281.

[7] Migne, 118, 817a.

[8] Geiselmann, *Studien*, p. 25.

CHAPTER XIX

BERENGAR AND THE FORMULA OF 1079

THE terminology of the formula of belief submitted to Berengar at the Roman Council of 1079 reveals the influence of the phraseology of Lanfranc and Guitmund. Lanfranc's treatise had been sent to Rome at the request of Alexander II.[1] Guitmund went to Rome in the time of Gregory VII, and was made Archbishop of Aversa by that pontiff, and as his book was written for general instruction,[2] it was doubtless well known at the Curia. The formula of 1059 had made no reference to the Radbertian doctrine of the identity of the eucharistic body with the historical body received from the Virgin. In the formula of 1079 this was clearly expressed. After consecration the eucharistic body is the true body of Christ which was born of the Virgin and was offered for our salvation and hung upon the Cross.[3] Yet the body of Christ sits at the right hand of the Father. In the formula of 1059 the sacramental body was defined by the terms 'verum' and 'in veritate.'[4] In 1079 it was described as being the 'proper nature' and 'true substance' of that body.[5] In the earlier formula Humbert defined the change with the simple statement that after consecration the bread and wine become the true body and blood of Christ. In 1079 Guitmund's terminology was definitely adopted, the bread and wine are *substantially* changed into the true and proper and life-giving flesh and blood of Jesus Christ,[1] and a symbolist interpretation was made impossible by the assertion that the body and blood really exist, and are not mediated merely in the sign and virtue of the sacrament.[2] Thus if the crude realism of Humbert, which described the body of Christ as being materially (sensualiter) present and not only sacramentally [3]—truly broken by the hands of the priest and ground by the teeth of the faithful—was avoided in 1079, yet the phraseology [4] as well as the theory of Transubstantiation henceforth became the official usage of the Church. It only remained to embody it in the decrees of a Lateran Council. But the word ' Transubstantiation ' itself had not yet appeared. If the *Exposition on the Canon of the Mass*,[5] formerly attributed to Peter Damiani, were genuine, the obscure question of the origin of the term ' transubstantiatio ' would be solved. But the contrast between the well-developed teaching of the *Expositio* and the vague mystical statements of Damiani's genuine writings makes the same authorship impossible.

---

[1] Giles, *Opera Lanfranci*, i. 27 ('Epis.' 5). [2] Hurter, xxxviii. 4.

[3] Mirbt, *Quellen*, p. 145; Jaffé, *Mon. Greg.*, p. 353; Lanfranc (Migne, 150, 411b–c): 'verum corpus Christi, quod natum est de Virgine, et quod pro salute mundi oblatum in cruce per-pendit.' Geiselmann, p. 405 n. 1, gives a different reading taken from Denziger-Umberg, p. 15 n. 355, 'pro salute nostra mundi.'

[4] Mirbt, p. 144; Migne, 150, 411a.

[5] 'in proprietate naturae et veritate substantiae.'

Berengar did not leave the formula submitted to him at Rome in 1079 unchallenged. His last recorded work is an account of the proceedings of the Council, and contains an apologia for his action on that occasion, and a criticism of the formula submitted to him. He begins with a characteristic quotation from Augustine : ' That which you see on the altar is bread and wine, as your eyes tell you, but faith demands that the bread is the body of Christ, and the wine is His blood.' [6] This, however, does not involve a substantial presence of Christ. The word ' substantialiter ' was inserted in the formula at the spring Council of 1079, contrary to the understanding which Berengar had secured with the Pope in the previous autumn.[7] He accepted it with a mental reservation, believing that he could ultimately turn it against his enemies.[8] Then comes an explanation in which he unblushingly confines the application of 'substantialiter' to the consecrated *bread*. The only way, he says, in which 'substantially' can be justifiably used, when speaking of the consecrated bread, is to say that the bread consecrated on the altar is the body of Christ 'saving its substance,'[1] for it does not lose what it was, but assumes what it was not.[2] Thus he places an impassable gulf between himself and his adversaries who used 'substantialiter' with reference to the eucharistic content—the body of Christ.

---

[1] ' panem et vinum . . . per mysterium sacrae orationis et verbo nostri Redemptoris substantialiter converti in veram et propriam ac vivificatricem carnem et sanguinem.'

[2] ' non tantum per signum et virtutem sacramenti.'

[3] ' non solum sacramento ' (Migne, 150, 411a).

[4] ' substantialiter converti.'

[5] Migne, 145, 879–892. *Cf. supra*, p. 333 n. 4 ; *infra*, p. 402 n. 1.

[6] Martène and Durand, iv. 103b. [7] *Ibid.* 104e. [8] *Ibid.* 105a.

In the Supper the bread receives, by the will of its Creator, efficacy or value for the salvation of the soul.[3] Otherwise, the use of 'substantialiter' means that the body is visibly present. The bread is the substance of the body of Christ to the understanding only,[4] as Augustine says: 'See on the altar one thing subject to the eyes, while the other has significance for your heart,' and 'It is the body and blood of Christ if what is visibly eaten in the sacrament is spiritually eaten and drunk.'[5] Then follow several quotations from the sayings of Christ, which are not very relevant to the subject; for example, Berengar argues that when Jesus said that He would not go up to Jerusalem on the feast day, He meant 'I will not go up on this day to the feast.'[6]

Under any interpretation of the word 'substantialiter,' the presence of the substance of bread and wine cannot be denied.[7] Throughout the *Acta Concilii Romani* Berengar consistently adheres to his fundamental denial of Transubstantiation,[8] and he denies the old Radbertian doctrine that the substance of the body of Christ 'is present, recently made, through the generation of its substance.'[9] He repeats his earlier teaching that there are two things in the sacrifice of Christ, the sacrament and 'the thing' of the sacrament.

---

[1] Martène and Durand, iv. 105a: 'salva sua substantia.'

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Ibid.* 105b: 'in cœna illa ut etiam ad salutem valeret animae nutu sui creatoris accepit.'

[4] *Ibid.*: 'oculo cordis tui, sed non oculo corporis, non manui, non denti.'

[5] *Ibid.* 105b–c. [6] *Ibid.* 105d–e. [7] *Ibid.* 106b–c.

[8] *Cf.* 106d–e, 107a, where he criticises the words of the formula 'veram et propriam ac vivicatricem carnem' on similar grounds.

[9] *Ibid.* 106b: 'subjectum vero corporis Christi per generationem subjecti sui recens factum adesse . . . tota contradicit auctoritas.' *Cf.* 106d.

The sacrament does not lose, through a corruption of substance, that which it was, nor does 'the thing of the sacrament' now first begin to be by the generation of the substance which it already possesses.[1]

The argument of his adversaries is really a negation of their theory. The formula of 1079 used the words 'through the mystery of prayer.' But a mystery necessitates two things, that which is exposed and that which is hidden. That which is exposed in the Eucharist is the sacrament; that which is concealed is the thing of the sacrament.[2] His meaning is that if the eucharistic content is substantially present, the mystery is destroyed, and he nowhere says that 'the thing of the sacrament' is hidden *in* the sacrament. He admits that a conversion of the bread and wine into the body and blood is according to Scripture,[3] but only in the sense that he has already explained,[4] and we have seen that in the *De Sacra Cœna* he uses the term 'conversio' in the sense of a new orientation supplied to the bread and wine, and not with any metabolic significance. Whatever is consecrated does not lose what it was, but is carried over into something better than it was. Both terms of the proposition are to be preserved—the subjective term 'bread and wine,' and the predicative term 'body and blood.'[5] He contended that the caution inserted in the formula 'not only through the sign and virtue of the sacrament' was wholly unnecessary, because no one could postulate the sacrament of the altar without the corresponding 'thing of the sacrament.'[6] Even in allegorical language there must be an existing equivalent of the illustration used. The use of a term like 'Scundapsus'[7] is admitted to be meaningless.[8]

But the existence of the 'thing of the sacrament' does not necessitate its actual presence in the sacrament. When our Lord blessed the bread and wine He raised them in dignity, so that beyond the natural substance which they bring to the body they may be efficacious for the help of the soul, thus setting them up as a *sacrament* of His body and blood.[1] Consequently, in the Berengarian system a real presence is not required because all that is of religious value is present in the consecrated elements in the sacrament, in contrast with the body of Christ in heaven. The virtue of the sign indeed lies in the thing signified,[2] the body of Christ in heaven, but, as he shows in this passage, the sign, or consecrated elements, only possess an acquired 'dignity,' following upon consecration, which gives to the bread and wine the efficacy or value of the body and blood for the fulfilment of the redemptive purpose. This is not a theory of the real presence.

---

[1] Martène and Durand, iv. 106c.

[2] *Ibid.* 106c.

[3] But such a statement does not appear in Scripture.

[4] Martène and Durand, iv. 106d–e.

[5] *Ibid.* 107a.

[6] *Ibid.* 107b.

[7] *Cf.* Du Cange, 'a word of no meaning.'

[8] Martène and Durand, iv. 107b.

In the light of this explanation is to be read his comment on the statement of the formula concerning the true nature and substance of the body of Christ. He denies that these words had any justifiable reference to his own views, because he had maintained that the bread and wine of the altar were not 'just anything,'[3] but the proper body of Christ, not phantasmal as the Manichees say, but true and human.[4] Probably Berengar is rebutting a charge of Docetism with reference to the Person of Christ, and his mind had, for the time being, directed its attention from the eucharistic question. Yet this passage has given rise to the contention that he held the doctrine of the real presence. But when the apologia is read as a whole it is clear that his convictions were the same as when he wrote the *De Sacra Cœna*, and as the *Acta Concilii Romani* was written as a recantation of his oath at Rome in 1079, this single passage cannot be produced as a final contradiction of all the rest of his recantation.

His apologia closes with an appeal for divine mercy for his weakness in allowing the term 'substantialiter' to be added to the definition which he had agreed to on All Saints' Day, 1078, and he commends the apologia to his readers as a confession made with tears, and asks for their prayers to propitiate the divine mercy on his behalf. This strong emotion is inexplicable if any of his statements in the *Acta* are to be interpreted as an admission of the doctrine of the real presence. Berengar was too acute a thinker to fail to perceive that if the only point at issue between himself and the authorities of the Church was his contention that the substance of the bread and wine remained, an effective compromise was possible at that date, when the doctrine of Transubstantiation was not so unreservedly demanded by the Church as at a later era. The criticism of Lanfranc and Guitmund pivoted on the other point raised by the controversy—his denial of the real presence; and it was so far as he realised that the addition of the word 'substantialiter' in 1079 constituted something more than a mere denial of the presence of the bread and wine after consecration, and introduced the presence of the body of Christ in the substantial sense defined by the realist thinkers, that his final statement betrays so strong a sentiment of regret.

---

[1] Martène and Durand, iv. 107c: 'sint etiam ad salutem animae efficaces.'

[2] *Ibid.* 107d.

[3] *Ibid.* 107e: 'alius cujusquam.'

[4] *Ibid.* 107e: 'proprium Christi corpus, non fantasticum . . . sed verum et humanum.'

The question of the real presence had been prominent from the beginning of the controversy. During the early period, which closed with the appearance of Durand's *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, the orthodox defence was almost entirely preoccupied with asserting and proving the reality of the sacramental content, though no doubt Berengar's consistent refusal to admit the disappearance of the bread and wine drew Lanfranc's attention to the sacramental process. In the second part of the dispute the battle was carried over to Berengar's field, and the theory of the change, first expressed in terms of essence (Lanfranc) and then in terms of substance (Guitmund), was developed. The question of Transubstantiation was the chief preoccupation of the orthodox writers during this period. The Berengarian objection that the elements of bread and wine were sensually perceptible was met by the theory that only the accidence remained after Transubstantiation had taken place. Moreover, the theory of Transubstantiation affected the conception of the real presence. To Durand the presence remained a mystery, hidden in the sacrament. The new theory of a substantial change enabled the later metabolists to define the presence as the eucharistic substance, hidden from sight, but clearly perceptible to the intellect, and really existing.[1] So late as the time of Theofrid,

[1] *Cf.* Geiselmann, p. 404 ff.

Abbot of Echternach, 1081–1110, the denial of the real presence was attacked as the specific teaching of the Berengarians,[1] and, on the contrary, Theofrid says that the sacrament represents the body which hung on the cross.[2] The real presence is hidden beneath the species of bread and wine.[3] Not until the days of Mabillon, the great seventeenth-century Benedictine scholar, did historical theologians raise the question whether Berengar was unorthodox on this point. Mabillon's powerful advocacy was reinforced by that of Martène and Durand at the beginning of the eighteenth century, but the Roman Catholic scholars of modern times, and especially Geiselmann of Paderborn, have readjusted the balance of Catholic criticism, and estimate, like the writers of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the teaching of Berengar as a denial of the doctrine of the real presence, as well as that of Transubstantiation.

---

[1] Migne, 157, 391b. On Theofrid *cf.* Hennecke (*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschite*, xlii. (1923) 112) and W. Lampen (*Thiofrid von Echternach* in *Kirchengesch. Abhandlungen*, Sdralek, Willig and Sappelt, Bd. xi. 1920).

[2] Migne, 157, 368a.

[3] *Ibid.*

CHAPTER XX

REALISM IN THE TWELFTH CENTURY

THE idea of 'the thing of the sacrament' as a real presence, and the doctrine of Transubstantiation as the mode of the sacramental change, were admitted to be the orthodox interpretation of the Eucharist before the end of the eleventh century. During the next century attempts were made to relate the new definitions with the rest of Catholic theology, and especially to connect it with the doctrine of the Incarnation.[1] The eleventh century was occupied with the philosophic or scientific definition and interpretation of the doctrine. The twelfth century conducted its theological grounding or foundation.[2]

This theological tendency is well emphasised in the *Exposition on the Canon of the Mass*, written by Odo, Bishop of Cambrai (d. 1113). Odo identifies the eucharistic body with the Logos, and with the reasonable soul and human flesh which the Logos united with itself at the Incarnation.[3] So he defines the host as God.[4] This represents a marked advance upon the teaching of Hugh of Langres and Durand, who somewhat vaguely spoke of the sacramental reality as identified with the divine-human personality of Christ.

Odo attempts to overcome the antinomy between the location of the risen body of Christ in heaven and the eucharistic presence on many altars—an antinomy which Berengar had indicated—by describing the Resurrection-body as being manifest and open, while the sacramental body on earth is covered and hidden from the senses.[5] Yet both are spiritual,[1] and although the eucharistic body is subject to the same material influences as other phenomena, it remains indestructible. It can be broken and yet remain intact.[2] The wine is truly received, and yet it is not present; no blood appears, and yet it is present.[3] He seeks to overcome the contradiction by asserting that God is everywhere,[4] and by distinguishing between physical and spiritual perception. To the eye, the body of Christ appears to be divided; to the spirit it remains one substance, so, while there are many hosts, there are not many bodies.[5] It is to be observed that if Odo makes use of Guitmund's distinction between the accidence which remains and the substance which is changed,[6] he also retains the more material language of Humbert. Not only the species but the 'things,' not only the form but the substance, are ground by the teeth.[7] The bread remains no longer, it is changed into another substance, it is now flesh.[8]

---

[1] This had been attempted by Justin Martyr, *Apol.*, i. 66.

[2] *Cf. supra*, p. 244 f.

[3] Migne, 160, 1060d.

[4] *Ibid.* 1061b : 'hostia quae Deus est.'

[5] *Ibid.* 1064b : 'nuda et aperta . . . tecta sensibilibus et occultata.'

That the relation between the doctrine of the Eucharist and other fundamental doctrines of the Church had not been worked out by the end of the eleventh century is shown by Cardinal Deusdedit (d. 1097–1100), who repeated the Berengarian idea that the Eucharist, in contrast with permanent sacraments like Baptism and the Chrism, was transitory in its effect. So the daily repetition of the sacrifice was necessary.[9] There is greater need of Baptism than of the Eucharist. The words 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man' (John vi. 53) refer only to those who are able to eat the flesh. It is sufficient if the newly baptized child receives the blood, he may not receive the body.[10] Heretics do not receive the virtue of the sacrament,[1] but only the sacrament, which prevents them from being deprived altogether of something 'holy' in their sacrament [2]—a view to which Urban II gave expression in a letter to Lucius of Pavia (1088–1090).[3]

---

[1] Migne, 160, 1064c: 'haec hostia caro est, non carnalis . . . corpus est, et non corporalis . . . spiritualis est et incorrupta.'

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Ibid.* 1063c: 'Sentitur vinum et non est. Non apparet sanguis, et est.'

[4] *Ibid.* 1067a: 'Quia Deus est ubique, non fit loci mutatione, ut conjungatur Deo de pane facta caro.'

[5] *Ibid.* 1068d f.

[6] *Ibid.* 1062b, 1063b: 'sub eisdem qualitatibus mutata substantia.'

[7] *Ibid.* 1062a: 'consumemus manducamus et atterimus non tantum specie, sed et re, non solum forma, sed et substantia.'

[8] *Ibid.* 1059c: 'in aliam mutetur substantiam'; 1061d: 'modo caro jam non panis.'

[9] *Libellus contra Invasores et Symoniacos* (*M.G.H. Lib. de Lit.*, ii. 325, Dümmler). *Cf. supra*, p. 326 f.

[10] *Lib. de Lit.*, ii. 323.

A critical view of heretical sacraments was maintained by the anonymous writer of an epistle which probably belongs to this era,[4] although the use of the term 'essentialiter,' and the emphasis laid on faith in the Augustinian sense, suggest an earlier date nearer the time of Lanfranc. The Eucharist is only valid when the recipient is in union with the Church.[5] That is the necessary prerequisite. The unworthiness of a consecrating priest does not invalidate the sacrament if he is in union with the Church. Heretical priests, therefore, cannot mediate the body and blood of Christ.[6]

The eucharistic content is the divine-human Person of Christ—the Word which in the beginning was with God, and became flesh, and was born of the Virgin. As the Word became flesh at the Incarnation and suffered on the Cross, so it becomes the sacramental body.[7] The historical body of Christ *again* becomes flesh sacramentally.[8] The Word unites itself with the bread and wine, and through its blessing changes them into flesh and blood.[9]

The sacramental body of the Lord is available only for the mystical body—the Church. The Eucharist unites the members of the mystical body, so that in the Eucharist Christ and the Church become one flesh.[10] The writer offers a peculiar solution of the problem created by believers who receive from heretical priests. There is a material altar and a spiritual altar. From the material altar of the Church both good and bad receive. The spiritual altar is faith, at which only the predestined receive, and they who receive from this altar receive Christ, for to eat Christ spiritually is to remain in Him, while

---

[1] *Lib. de Lit.*, ii. 325. *Cf.* p. 324.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 323.

[3] Geiselmann, p. 428 n. 1.

[4] *Ibid.* pp. 426, 428 ff.

[5] *Lib. de Lit.*, iii. 15.

[6] *Ibid.* pp. 13, 18.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 17: 'sub sacramento panis et vini, idem verbum caro fieret vere et essentialiter, quod natum est de virgine, quod passum est in cruce.'

[8] *Ibid.*: 'rursus in cena verbum caro factum est sacramentaliter simul et essentialiter.'

[9] *Ibid.*: 'verbum univit se pani et vino et sua benedictione et unitate convertit panem in carnem et vinum in sanguinem.'

[10] *Ibid.*

He remains in them. This spiritual food the righteous receives, even if he never outwardly separates from heretics and schismatics.[1]

The founder of the Carthusian Order, Bruno of Köln (d. 1101), was a former pupil of Berengar, but his eucharistic teaching, which appears in two of his writings, was influenced by that of Anselm of Canterbury. The sacramental body and blood signify the salvation of body and soul. The blood being the centre of the soul quite properly signified the soul,[2] although Christ is not divided by the two substances, for the reception of either blood or body imparts the whole Christ. Unlike Odo of Cambrai, Bruno relates his theory of the sacrament rather to the human nature of Christ than to the spiritualised Resurrection-body, and he gives expression to a modern Anglican sacramental theory. Spiritual grace can only be mediated through a material channel, and he makes use of an Augustinian concept [3] when he says that a purely spiritual form can only be received by angels, not by men.[4]

The body of Christ is present in the sacrament in an immortal and impassible form, and this was its condition at the Last Supper.[5] There is an actual change in the sacrament. That which was bread before is now actually body, and the substance of wine is now blood,[6] but the appearance and flavour of bread and wine are retained,[7] and he adopts the teaching of Anselm of Canterbury that the body of Christ is only ground by the teeth in its species or accidence,[8] but the process is an insoluble mystery.[9] While the whole body is received in each fragment of the host, there is a symbolic significance in the distribution. The unity and yet apparent division of the body of Christ signify the union of many individuals in Christ.[10] The twofold nature of the sacrament, the body and blood, represents no actual separation. The reception of either body or blood secures the whole Christ, and he who receives both receives no more.[1] The Eucharist is related to the plural on account of the number of those who receive it, not because its content is manifold.[2] While the Eucharist is the true body, and the true flesh and blood,[3] it has a representative significance. It represents, in the cultus, the death of Christ,[4] it mediates salvation, and liberates and preserves from sin.[5]

---

[1] *Lib. de Lit.*, iii. 18. *Cf.* Gezo of Tortona, *supra*, p. 244.

[2] Migne, 153, 176b : 'digne per sanguinem, qui sedes animae dicitur, animam figuravit.' *Cf.* Druthmar (*supra*, p. 230, n. 9) and Origen (Bigg, *Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, 1913, p. 267).

[3] Augustine, *En. in Psa. 33*, i. 6 (Migne, 36, 303 f.).

[4] Migne, 152, 1038b.

[5] *Ibid.* 153, 185a.

[6] *Ibid.* 184d–185a ; *cf.* 152, 1039b.

[7] *Ibid.* 153, 185b ; *cf.* 176a.

[8] *Ibid.* 176c ; 152, 1038d.

[9] *Ibid.* 152, 1038d.

[10] *Ibid.* 153, 176a, 184c.

Although the systematisation of theology did not take place until the second half of the twelfth century, indications of a desire to embrace the whole theological field in one sweeping glance are not wanting in the first half of that era, and we have seen that even earlier the tendency appeared. It was deflected for a time by the eucharistic controversy, which concentrated upon one point of reference. But Hugh of Langres and Durand, by fixing the effecting principle of the Eucharist in the divine Word, showed the way towards the comprehension of sacramental doctrine within the doctrinal system of the Incarnation. This was indeed a revival of the ancient method of Irenæus, although no trace of the influence of Irenæus upon metabolic eucharistic teaching of the eleventh and twelfth centuries is to be found. A definite stage in this development was marked when Anselm of Canterbury (d. 1109) embodied the doctrine of the Eucharist within his theology of the Atonement.

In order to save human nature, which was dead in body and soul, God must become incarnate in body and soul.[6] So Anselm perceives in the bread and wine the body and soul of Christ. The blood is the seat of the soul,[7] according to the Old Testament idea. To complete his description of the atoning process, he describes the water which is mingled with the wine as the equivalent of the water which flowed from the side of Christ, and this, in turn, symbolises Baptism and its effects.[8]

---

[1] Migne, 153, 176b–c. The practice of withholding the cup from the laity originated in this period.

[2] *Ibid.* 152, 1038d.

[3] *Ibid.* 153, 572a; *cf.* 184c, 176c.

[4] *Ibid.* 185b: 'repraesentabitur mortem Domini.'

[5] *Ibid.* 176a.

[6] 'Epis.' 107 (Migne, 159, 255a).

[7] Migne 159, 255b: 'per sanguinem, qui sedes est animae.'

[8] *Ibid.* 255c.

If symbolical, the body and blood of Christ are no less real, and they become effective for mankind through the sacrifice of the Cross.[1] This flesh is identical in nature with the substance from which man was first formed, although it is now seated in heaven.[2] Again, although he distinguishes between the symbolism of the bread and the symbolism of the wine, there is no separation of the body and blood of Christ for the recipient. In the reception of the body the whole Christ is present; so also in the reception of the blood[3]—teaching which marks an advance upon that of Lanfranc, who had contrasted the reception of the details of body and blood (which are distinguished in the bread and wine respectively) with the reception of the whole divine-human personality of Christ. According to Lanfranc the body and blood are received objectively, the whole personality of Christ subjectively.[4] For Anselm the whole Person of Christ is objectively present in spite of the medium of two sacramental elements.[5]

The question of the use of leavened or unleavened bread, a Carolingian problem, revived in the eleventh-century discussion with the Greek Church, Anselm did not regard as important for the validity of the Eucharist.[6] Whatever kind of bread was used, the sacramental change rendered it effective, by sanctifying and transforming the elements.[7] The substance of the bread and wine was changed; only the species, its form, colour, and flavour remained.[8]

Unworthy and worthy alike receive the substance of the Lord's body, which remains unaffected by the condition of the receiver. Only the species of the sacrament are destroyed by the teeth of the recipient, or by animals, or are touched by unworthy priests.[9] Yet some obscurity surrounds Anselm's teaching at this point, for if the unworthy receive the substance of the body of the Lord,[1] reception by the worthy is of a special kind, and through it the faithful receive salvation, by the restoration of the image of God, and purification and preservation from sin.[2] He makes use of the ancient Ignatian conception of the body and blood as the salve for the wounds of sin,[3] whereby virtue is increased, the will is strengthened, immortality, impassibility, and future-life are mediated.[4] But frequent reception is necessary, and the repetition of sin necessitates a daily sacrificial offering.[5]

---

[1] Or. 25 (Migne, 158, 912d f.); *ibid.* 26 (*ibid.* 915a f.); *ibid.* 29 (*ibid.* 921a ff.); Medit. iv. (*ibid.* 735a).

[2] Or. 26 (Migne, 158, 916b): 'Haec autem caro quam ei ad manducandum dedit de natura ejusdem limi fuit, unde primum hominem plasmavit.'

[3] 'Epis.' 107 (Migne, 159, 255b).

[4] Geiselmann, p. 410.

[5] *Resp. ad Waleranni Querelas* (Migne, 158, 553a).

[6] *De Tribus Waleranni Quaest.* (Migne, 158, 541 ff.).

[7] Migne, 158, 543c. *Cf.* 924b ('efficere'); *ibid.* 159, 258a ('transfundere'); *ibid.* 159, 256a ('mutari').

[8] *Ibid.* 159, 256a.

[9] *Ibid.* 256a–b, 257a.

Ranger, Bishop of Lucca (d. 1112), maintains the indestructibility of the body of Christ, although it is eaten and drunk by the people. The body rests in the hands of the priest,[6] but if the Lord thus empowers His servant to do greater things than He did Himself, it is the Lord who operates through the priest.[7]

Ivo of Chartres (d. 1116), a pupil of Lanfranc, contributed little that was new to the development of the doctrine. The Eucharist is the truth of which the Old Testament symbols were types.[8] Christ is the gift and Christ is the priest in this sacrifice.[9] Like Lanfranc he does not completely identify the sacramental with the historical body. In dealing with a question which was repeatedly discussed during this period—namely, the condition in which Christ is present in the sacrament—he maintains that the body received by the disciples was mortal.[10] They received the essence, but not the future glory of Christ's body.[11] We, on the contrary, receive the impassible, immortal body,[12] which is identical with the historical body invisibly, but not in appearance.[13] Lanfranc had said that the heavenly bread, which is the true flesh of Christ, is, in its special relation, called the body of Christ.[14] Ivo refines the statement down to a purely sacramental definition by adding 'since it is the true sacrament of the body of Christ.'[1]

---

[1] Migne, 159, 256b: 'non tamen negandum quod ipsi mali veram substantiam corporis Christi accipiunt.' [2] *Ibid.* 158, 919 f., 927.

[3] *Ibid.* 916b. [4] *Ibid.* 159, 256b. [5] *Ibid.* 257a.

[6] *Lib. de Lit.*, ii. 517 (*Lib. de Anulo et Baculo*, line 405 ff.).

[7] *Ibid.* 518 (*ibid.*, line 425 ff.).

[8] Migne, 162, 554b. [9] *Ibid.* 555d.

[10] *Ibid.* 285c: 'dederit eis corpus suum passibile.'

[11] *Ibid.* 286b: 'ejusdem esse substantiae . . . futurum esse alterius gloriae.'

[12] *Ibid.* 285c: 'accipiamus impassibile.' *Cf. ibid.* 161, 138c.'

[13] *Ibid.* 161, 156b: 'ipsum visibiliter'; 162, 286d: 'Ipsius quidem materiali essentia, sed non visibili forma.'

[14] *Ibid.* 150, 425a: 'suo modo.'

Although like Guitmund he speaks of a change of substance,[2] he revives Lanfranc's use of the term 'essence,' and repeats Berengar's idea of the creation of a new efficacy or effective principle for the consecrated elements through the sacramental process.[3] He uses 'material' as an equivalent for the philosophic idea of substance. The sacramental content is a 'material essence.'[4] But he makes use of the older term 'species' in place of accidence when describing the external qualities of bread and wine, which remain unchanged, although the body of Christ is actually present,[5] hidden beneath the visible species of the elements.[6]

Together with Lanfranc Ivo adapts the Augustinian definition of the sacrament as a sacred sign to the current theory of Transubstantiation.[7] Like Bruno of Köln he sees a symbolism of the Passion in the Eucharist,[8] and although there are two elements of bread and wine, they represent one Passion.[9] Similarly, although the host is broken into three parts, it represents the unity of the Christian Church. The first part signifies the actual body which lies in the grave; the second represents that portion of the body of Christ—the Church—which enjoys a sabbath rest in immortality; the third part, or the wine in the cup, signifies that part of the Church which here and now drinks the cup of suffering with the Lord.[10]

The continental writers have passed over in silence Herbert of Losinga, Bishop of Norwich (1091–1119).[11] His teaching on the Eucharist appears in an Easter sermon,[1] and so recalls the Paschal sermon of Ælfric. It shows the influence of Paschasius Radbert, but anticipates some queries which were raised after the time of Herbert. He does not discuss the mode of the change, but states simply that the material bread, which is on the altar,[2] is made (efficitur) the flesh of Christ through the office of the priest.[3] He identifies the eucharistic body with the flesh received from the Virgin, which hung on the cross and rose from the dead,[4] and which was substantially, not in mere appearance, revealed to the disciples.[5] The appearance of Radbertian teaching is not remarkable, even at this late date, in the writings of an ecclesiastic who belonged to a section of the Church which was of necessity, in spite of the work of Lanfranc and the influx of Norman clergy, isolated from the main stress of continental thought,[6] especially since the reference appears in a sermon which was actually preached. Preaching always lags behind theological disquisition, and we shall see the same tardiness operating in Italy, even later in the twelfth century.

---

[1] Migne, 161, 154d: 'cum revera sit sacramentum corporis Christi.'

[2] *Ibid.* 1074a: 'non substantia, sed species remanet.'

[3] *Ibid.* 162, 558d: 'in aliam essentiam et efficientiam mutas.'

[4] *Ibid.* 286d: 'materiali essentia.' He cannot have the essence of bread in mind, because he expressly states that the substance of bread does not remain.

[5] *Ibid.* 161, 1074a: 'sed species remanet.' *Cf.* 1073b–c.

[6] *Ibid.* 152d, 1071d.

[7] *Ibid.* 1074a; *cf.* 147c.

[8] *Ibid.* 162, 554d.

[9] *Ibid.* 554b.

[10] *Ibid.* 559c.

[11] *Cf.* Goulburn and Symonds, *The Life, Letters and Sermons of Bishop Herbert de Losinga* (1878). The second volume contains the text of the *Sermons*, together with a translation. The letters were printed by R. Anstruther for the Caxton Society (1844), and at Brussels (1846). Perhaps the absence of the *Sermons* from any of the big collections of medieval writers accounts for the oversight of Herbert by continental writers. Darwell Stone's silence is even more remarkable.

But if Herbert does not discuss the sacramental process he states emphatically that a change takes place [7] through the instrumentality of the word of Christ.[8] All things are possible to the Word of God : if it could bring about creation from nothing, much more can it make something from something,[9] an argument used by the majority of eleventh- and twelfth-century writers, and dating back to Carolingian times,[10] when, however, the emphasis was laid upon the will of God. By laying stress upon the action of the word, Herbert is abreast of early twelfth-century teaching, which sought to connect eucharistic doctrine with the Incarnation. Yet he does not, like his contemporary Anselm, identify the eucharistic body with the Logos, but with the risen body of Christ which now exists incorruptible and immortal at the right hand of God,[1] although it is bruised and ground by the true mastication of the teeth, and is corporally eaten and drunk [2]—a statement which in its crudity is reminiscent of Humbert.

---

[1] Goulburn and Symonds, ii., *Sermon VII*, 152–201 ; for the passages on the Eucharist *cf.* 181–201.

[2] *Ibid.* 180 : 'Panis est quem videtis, panis quidem materialis.' G. and S. wrongly translate 'materialis' by 'substantial' on the ground that Lanfranc contrasts it with 'spirituale' and 'invisibile' (183 n., quoting Migne, 150, 438d).

[3] Goulburn and Symonds, ii. 182.

[4] *Ibid.* 184 ff.

[5] *Ibid.* 186 : 'non fantastice set (*sic*) substantialiter.'

[6] Herbert was born in Suffolk (G. and S., i. 5), and although educated at Fécamp, of which he became Prior (G. and S., i. 54), his preaching was probably adapted to the capacity of the clergy and monks at Norwich. *Cf.* Gregory of Bergamo (*infra*, p. 395 ff.).

[7] Goulburn and Symonds, ii. 188 : 'magna rerum conversio.'

[8] *Ibid.* 182 : 'ad verba Christi panis iste efficitur caro Christi.'

[9] *Ibid.* 188 ff.

[10] *Cf.* Paschasius (Migne, 120, 1268c).

Herbert does not discuss the distinction between the sacrament and its content.[3] To the preacher the sacrament is simply that which is given [4] or received.[5] He imparts the late eleventh-century idea that the whole body is present in each fragment of the host, without separation or division and without spot,[6] and he is in agreement with contemporary thought on the reception of the body and blood by good and bad alike,[7] but the latter eat to their condemnation, and only in a material and temporal manner. He reserves, following Augustine, the spiritual feeding for the elect.[8] Herbert's doctrine combines, without any attempt at correlation, elements of Carolingian and contemporary teaching, and one peculiarly English statement appears. He speaks of receiving the *Communion* of the body and blood of the Lord.[9]

William of Champeaux (d. 1121), like Ivo of Chartres, describes the symbolism of the eucharistic elements and the different modes of administration. The reception of two distinct species represents the body which hung on the Cross, and the blood which flowed from the side of the Saviour.[10] Therefore the Church maintains the twofold symbolism, although Christ is wholly present in each species,[11] or in both [12] —a view popularised by Anselm of Canterbury. But William of Champeaux moves a step nearer the time when the cup was withdrawn from the laity by stating his own opinion that the demand for communion in both kinds was heretical,[1] for Christ, since His Resurrection, cannot be sundered into separate modes of existence, the flesh does not exist without the blood, nor both without the soul, nor the human nature without the Logos, with which it is personally united.[2] So children receive the whole Christ in the blood, and this is as necessary for them as Baptism,[3] and was a practice which Innocent I had officially ordered.[4] With Arnulf of Rochester he approved the practice of intinction, which Ivo seems to condemn.[5] Although intinction is not generally to be used on account of its similarity with the communion of Judas, yet where it takes place in good faith it may be sanctioned,[6] as John, Archbishop of Rouen, who died in 1079, had allowed in certain cases.[7] This practice was condemned by Bernold of Constance, save on Good Friday when the host dipped in unconsecrated wine had the effect of consecrating the latter.[8]

---

[1] Goulburn and Symonds, ii. 188, 196.

[2] *Ibid.* 194: 'Atteritur et commeditur vera nostrorum dentium commestione'; 190: 'corporaliter . . . cibantur et potantur'; 196: 'corporali commestione.'

[3] G. and S. (*ibid.* 22 ff.) have collected several usages of the term 'sacrament' employed by Herbert. But their attempt to see in his teaching a distinction between the outward and inward parts of the sacrament is not borne out by his terminology.

[4] *Ibid.* 180. [5] *Ibid.* 192. [6] *Ibid.* [7] *Ibid.* 196.

[8] *Ibid.* 196 ff. [9] *Ibid.* 304 (*Sermon XI* on the Festival of S. Paul).

[10] Migne, 163, 1039b. [11] *Ibid.* 1040b. [12] *Ibid.* 1039b.

Arnulf of Rochester (d. 1124) replies to certain difficulties mentioned by a correspondent named Lambert on points which illustrate the gradual formulation of orthodox procedure in relation to practical details. Arnulf, unlike Ivo, sees no objection to intinction. Christ, who arranged for us the sacramental content, laid down no regulations for the place or method of administration.[9] The word ' This ' in the words of institution does not refer to the manner of administration.[10] But he is less explicit on the question of the indestructibility of Christ's glorified body. Although the body of the Lord is the cause of salvation,[11] and therefore has intrinsic virtue or

[1] Migne, 163, 1040b : ' Quod ergo dicitur utramque speciem opportere accipi, haeresis plane est.' Migne here quotes a statement of Mabillon that communion in both kinds survived to the twelfth century in the practice of intinction.

[2] *Ibid.* 1040b. [3] *Ibid.* 1039c.

[4] Augustine, *Con. Jul. Pel.*, i. 13 (Migne, 44, 648), quoting Innocent.

[5] Migne, 161, 181a. [6] *Ibid.* 163, 1039b. [7] *Ibid.* 147, 37a.

[8] *Ibid.* 151, 980c : ' vinum non consecratum, cum Dominica oratione et Dominici corporis immersione jubet consecrare, ut populus plane possit communicare.' Geiselmann (p. 425 n. 1), quoting Morin, *Rev. Bénéd.* (1891), p. 385 ff., assigns the *Micrologus* to Bernold.

[9] D'Achery, *Spicilegium*, iii. 471, 1 : ' verbo vel exemplo insinuavit quae facienda erant docens, certum quo facienda erant modum praefigere omittere . . . pro ratione vero necessitatis vel honestatis, alio et alio modo fieri licet.'

[10] *Ibid.* [11] *Ibid.* 472, 2.

reality, yet its fraction has a symbolic significance. Its three portions, which resemble the Trinity or the three conditions of the Church—bishops, celibates, and married—symbolise the three conditions of the Lord's body. It lived on earth; was dead and rose again; and became the source of faith, love, and hope.[1] The two sacramental elements are symbolical of the broken body and shed blood of the Lord's Passion. They also symbolise the condition of His physical life, which consisted of body and blood. But the whole Christ is received in each of the two elements [2]—all details in reply to Lambert's question how and why the blood could be received without the body, and probably with reference to the administration of the cup to children.

Lambert also asked why, if the sacramental body has a soul, does it not move, and, on the contrary, how, if it has no soul, can it be the risen living body? To this extravagant development of realist doctrine Arnulf replies that the theory of Transubstantiation supplies the answer. The substance only of the bread is changed. The qualities, perceptible to touch and taste, remain immovably. So, on the other hand, the substance of flesh is present without its qualities.[3]

Guibert, Abbot of Nogent, who was born in 1053 and died in 1124, wrote a long epistle [4] to Siegfrid, Prior of S. Nicholas or S. Vincent, at Nogent, replying to questions on the dish given to Judas at the Last Supper, and on the reality of the body of the Lord. He also wrote at length on the relics of the saints, a work in which he devotes a whole book to the twofold nature of the eucharistic body.[5] The first of these writings is especially directed against 'the Berengarian heresy.' [6]

It was argued by some, he says, that unless the sacrament was a sign, rather than reality, it would not have been offered by the Lord to Judas.[7] But Judas received a sign of his treachery and not the sacrament,[8] and the bread and wine were only changed for his reception, so far as they were touched by the Saviour.[9] His meaning seems to be that the change took place in relation to Jesus, but not in relation to Judas. In our Eucharist the elements are substantially changed through the Saviour's words into divine flesh,[1] but this substance is non-material, because the essence of bread and wine cannot be conceived as existing in the divine essence.[2] While the species of bread and wine remain, there must be something additional after the consecration prayer.[3] If they remain mere species, they present the mere symbolism of the statement 'That rock was Christ' (1 Cor. x. 4),[4] and the new covenant is only equivalent to the baptism of John.[5] If the bread and wine are a shadow, and not the body of Christ, we only receive one shadow in place of another ; nay worse, the eucharistic symbols are less effective than the Old Testament sacrifices, which were composed of real substances.[6] If the eucharistic body is only a figure of the Lord's suffering it remains ineffective.[7] But through consecration the host becomes vivifying and the symbol and form yield to something which is effective for life and salvation to the soul.[8] If His body seems to be present in particles, that is because, by a well-known usage, a part stands for the whole,[9] but the whole body is received in the smallest particle.[10] No question of quantity arises,[11] for when Christ said 'me,' He referred to the whole of His substance.[12] The whole body is in the blood as well as in the body, for Lev. vii. teaches that 'all the life of the flesh is in the soul,' [13] a statement resembling the teaching of Bruno of Köln, who made use of the Old Testament idea of the blood as the seat of the soul.

---

[1] D'Achery, *Spicilegium*, iii. 472, 2.
[2] *Ibid.* 473, 1.
[3] *Ibid.* 474, 1.
[4] Migne, 156, 527–538.
[5] *Ibid.* 629–650.
[6] *Ibid.* 530c.
[7] *Ibid.* 529b.
[8] *Ibid.* 529a.
[9] *Ibid.* 530a: 'non ex mutatione sui aliqua, sed ex tactu forsitan Salvatoris accepit.' *Cf.* 529a.

The eucharistic food is not human, but super-substantial.[14] Even the Trinity is not predicated substantially of God, but is a description God made to meet human needs.[15] This is a new note in sacramental doctrine, and Guibert indicates yet another stage in the clarification of dogma from the materialism of the eleventh-century realists, by breaking away entirely from the Radbertian identification of the eucharistic body with the historical body of Christ. There are three bodies : that which was received from the Virgin, that which is brought about (agitur) in the Eucharist, and that which sits at the right hand of God. The eucharistic body is the same as the Resurrection body,[1] and if anyone says that the body born of the Virgin is the same as the incorruptible body which went to the Father, he errs.[2] The eucharistic body is only ' vicariously ' identified with the body born from the Virgin, which to this limited extent is causal,[3] and supplies material for the sacraments which flow from it.[4] On the other hand, he says that they who assert that the host is a sign without reality imply that the human body of Christ was a mere sign.[5] If the presence is not real, it is no more actual than the memory of her husband excited by a woman's ring.[6]

---

[1] Migne, 156, 534c. [2] *Ibid.* 630c–d, 631a. [3] *Ibid.* 532b.
[4] *Ibid.* 531c. [5] *Ibid.* 530d. [6] *Ibid.* 530c.
[7] *Ibid.* 531a : 'si sola passi figura, ut dicitur, sit, si quid vera efficiat, nescio.'
[8] *Ibid.* 531d–532a. [9] *Ibid.* 632a.
[10] *Ibid.* 529a, 530a. He uses 'portiuncula' (Berengar's term) and 'buccella.'
[11] *Ibid.* 522d–533a. [12] *Ibid.* 633d : 'Quid ergo dicit me,' etc.
[13] *Ibid.* 634a. [14] *Ibid.* 641b. [15] *Ibid.* 532c.

Guibert makes use of Lanfranc's symbolism. The Eucharist is not bread, the bread is only signified,[7] and the species are a shadow,[8] but Guibert also uses the ancient Greek symbolism. He says that he does not conceive of ' particularity ' or the actual body of Christ in the sacrament, but a form or figure, which is wholly that which precedes it,[9] just as the Son and Holy Spirit are identical with the Father who preceded them as an originating principle.[10] If the original body which supplied material for the sacraments remained partly on earth and partly in heaven, what necessity would there be to postulate another body [11] (*i.e.* a eucharistic body) ? Thus he approximates to the theory of Berengar which he criticises. He appears to make use of a twofold symbolism. The eucharistic body is mystical, and is figurative of the causative body which is the real body of Christ in heaven. The eucharistic body is prepared beneath the shadow or the symbols of the bread and wine.[1] Was he attempting to synthesise the teaching of Lanfranc and Berengar through the medium of the old Greek notion ?

---

[1] Migne, 156, 648b–649b.
[2] *Ibid.* 650b, 630 ff.
[3] *Ibid.* 629d–630a.
[4] *Ibid.* 634c.
[5] *Ibid.* 532a.
[6] *Ibid.* 629d : ' hic praesentia, si aliud esset quam ipse proprietas,' etc.
[7] *Ibid.* 535a : ' quia nil de ipsa praeter speciem panis essentia in hoc sacrificio se habere fide mente confirmat.'
[8] *Ibid.* 629c : ' umbra sit secundum speciem.'
[9] *Ibid.* 630c : ' Speciem vero non particularitatem, sed figuram, quam usus exterior praetendit, accipio, cum sit hoc totum quod est praecedens suum.'
[10] *Ibid.*
[11] *Ibid.* 630d f. ; *cf.* 634c.

His theory of the change is equally indistinct, in spite of some statements which point to the contrary. He approaches the impanation idea when he says ' Ought He not to embowel in the substance of bread and wine the most affluent illapse of divinity as a representation of Himself to us ? '[2] So also his terminology for the definition of a sacrament is not clear. He starts from the Augustinian contrast between a sacrament and the thing of the sacrament or that which is visible.[3] He then defines a sacrament as an oath, a sacred thing, and a mystery, and limits the meaning of the eucharistic sacrament to a sacred thing and a mystery. The unworthy do not receive the sacred thing,[4] but, presumably, the mystery only. This terminology thus equates mystery with species or symbol, an entirely original interpretation. The writings of Guibert discuss several problems which arose on the confines of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, when the practical implications of realist doctrine began to be worked out, and he treats the subject with considerable independence of attitude, and always with freshness in expression and novelty in illustration.

---

[1] Migne, 156, 634c : ' Quia igitur de bipertito corpore Domini, vero videlicet (quod superius principale diximus, unde haec sequentia sacramenta manarunt) ac mystico, quod figuratum supra appellavimus, quo omni luce purior Veritas sub panis ac vini umbra conficitur.' *Cf.* 650b: ' sub figura agitur.'

[2] *Ibid.* 635a : ' panis ac vini substantiae ad sui nobis representationem affluentissimum totius divinitatis illapsum inviscerare non debuit ? '

[3] *Ibid.* 635d, 642d.

[4] *Ibid.* 638c : ' Sacramentum autem trifariam dividitur. Pro jure jurando namque ponitur, et pro re quoque sacrata dici solet, pro mysterio etiam accipitur. Sit ergo res sacra, sitque mysterium, hoc totum fit sublata re sacramenti, indigno supplicium.'

CHAPTER XXI

ALGER OF LIÈGE TO GREGORY OF BERGAMO

ALGER was scolasticus of Liège until 1121, when he joined the community at Cluny, and died there before 1128. He wrote a lengthy work, the *De Sacramentis Corporis et Sanguinis Domini*,[1] in three books, which ranks with the treatise of Guitmund in Catholic estimation. Alger follows Guitmund in the plan of his work and in method of treatment, although on some points he arrives at more definite conclusions than the earlier writer. Peter the Venerable, the ninth Abbot of Cluny, who died in 1156, maintained that Alger discussed the doctrine better, more fully, and more perfectly than his predecessors Lanfranc and Guitmund.[2] This praise is too fulsome, especially as the influence of Guitmund upon Alger's book appears in every part of the work. Like Guitmund, he begins by stating that he proposes to deal with current heresies,[3] and mentions six types of heretical teaching. Some say that the bread and wine are not changed, and that the Eucharist is only a sacrament like Baptism or the Chrism, that it is not the true body of Christ, and can only be so called figuratively.[4] Others say that Christ was impanated in the bread, as He was personally incarnate in the flesh.[5] Others, making use of the Adoptian heresy, describe a change not into flesh and blood, but into that of 'any son of man holy and acceptable to God,' not into the flesh and blood of Christ.[6] Others say that the change cannot be effected by the consecration of an unworthy priest.[7] Others, again, who believe in the change, allege that when unworthy men receive the Eucharist, the flesh of Christ returns into the sacrament of bread and wine only;[1] and finally, others say that the body of Christ is subject to corruption through the process of digestion.[2] All these objections are discussed in detail throughout the work, but Alger's chief aim in writing was the refutation of Berengar. He reminds his readers that at the Council of Rome in 1059 Berengar confessed his belief in the real presence of the body of Christ before Pope Nicholas and the hundred and thirteen bishops,[3] and he quotes the oath in full.[4]

---

[1] Hurter, xxiii.; Migne, 180, 743–854. [2] Migne, 189, 788d.
[3] Hurter, xxiii. 58 f. [4] *Ibid.* 59 f. [5] *Ibid.* 60.
[6] *Ibid.*: 'panem et vinum in carnem et sanguinem mutari, sed non Christi, sed cujuslibet filii hominis sancti et Deo accepti.'
[7] *Ibid.* 60.

Alger belongs to the school of orthodox dialectic writers. He uses the syllogism,[5] and his method includes statement, demonstration, and proof. But he is ready to abandon the assistance of dialectics when it conflicts with orthodox opinion,[6] and he criticises the conclusions of the dialecticians freely.[7] With Anselm of Canterbury and other contemporaries, he begins with a broad theological view of his subject, and seeks to relate it with the whole doctrine of the Incarnation.[8] He treats the Eucharist from the standpoint of theology and is not content with the defence of mere dogma. In this way he supplements the teaching of Guitmund, and perhaps for this reason his work impressed the Abbot of Cluny more than that of Lanfranc or Guitmund. The Eucharist is part of the great process of reconciliation with God, effected by the Incarnation and Atonement.[9] In the Eucharist the Church is united and made concorporate with the body of Christ, who restored fallen man by uniting human nature with Himself through the assumption of flesh at the Incarnation.[10] We receive His flesh and blood beneath a mystery, and by this means we are one with Him. As the Father is in Him, and He is in us, the sacrament is the agent of a perfect unity.[1] We become concorporal, consanguineous, and consacramental with Him in this spiritual unity.[2]

---

[1] Hurter, xxiii. 60: 'reverti in purum sacramentum panis et vini.'

[2] *Ibid.* 60.

[3] *Ibid.* 117.

[4] *Ibid.* 218 ff. Most contemporary writers refer only to this Council, omitting any reference to the Councils of 1050 and 1079. It is difficult to account for the omission of that of 1079, which really settled the dispute. Perhaps the oath drawn up by Humbert in 1059 was of greater interest for the next generation.

[5] *Ibid.* 94, 105 f., 117 f., etc.

[6] *Ibid.* 116, 252.

[7] *Ibid.* 252.

[8] Lib. i. cap. 1–2 (*ibid.* 68 ff.).

[9] Hurter, xxiii. 77.

[10] *Ibid.* 78: 'Ecclesiam sibi uniens et concorporans . . . in veritate sui corporis, vere sibi concorporatam.' *Cf.* the whole passage, 78–91.

But Alger contrasts the process of the Incarnation and that of the Eucharist. The Word became flesh, and was born flesh of flesh. It was not changed into flesh. It was made what it was not, and did not cease to be that which it was. The bread becomes the same flesh by being changed into flesh. So it becomes what it was not, and ceases to be that which it was [3]—a direct inversion of Berengar's interpretation of the Ambrosian statement.

The 'mystery' is our unity with Christ in the sacrament,[4] and it is twofold in character, comprising the mystery of the sacramental body which is Christ, and the mystery of the mystical body of Christ, or the Church.[5] On the analogy of the head and members 'our mystery' does not exist without 'His mystery.' The twofold aspect of the mystery is merged in the unity of the body of Christ in the Eucharist.[6] No more ample definition of the term 'mystery' had so far appeared in the history of eucharistic doctrine, and Alger's explanation is based on Augustine's comment on 'Ye are the body of Christ.'[7]

But if the body of Christ is present in the sacrament as a mystery, it is no less really and substantially present.[8] He offered His body and blood to us substantially and truly in the sacrament, so that it is everywhere present corporally.[1] But here contradiction creeps into his argument. Although the substance of Christ's body was not changed at the Resurrection, yet it is *not* corporally but spiritually and invisibly present in the sacrament.[2] When the invisible body of Christ is called the sacrament of the visible body of Christ, it is to be accepted mentally only on account of the external operation (*i.e.* because mediated through bread and wine) and not materially.[3] It is a super-substantial body.[4] Even the bread does not constitute a material body, only the species of the bread is corporal.[5] While Christ is prepared corporally in the sacrament of the bread and wine, He is not personally united with them.[6]

---

[1] Hurter, xxiii. 80: 'naturalis per sacramentum proprietas perfectae sacramentum est unitatis.' *Cf.* 277.

[2] *Ibid.* 89: 'per unitatem spiritualem ita concorporales et consacramentales sumus Christo'; 215 f.: 'non solum concorporales, sed et consanguinei Christo spiritualiter efficimur.' *Cf.* 211.

[3] *Ibid.* 101.

[4] *Ibid.* 80: 'nos vere sub mysterio carnem corporis sui sumimus, et per hoc unum erimus.'

[5] *Ibid.* 87: 'cum panis dominicus corpus Christi sit in seipso, et corpus Christi in Ecclesia mirabili unitatis gratia nos ad se pertinere voluit, cum mysterium nostrum sicut et suum in sacramento altaris . . . concessit.' *Cf.* 181.

[6] *Ibid.* 88: 'etiam mysterium suum in veritate corporis sui sumptum nulli prosit, nisi mysterium nostrum, societatem scilicet ecclesiasticam eodem sacramento assumpserit; quia, sicut caput non est vitale sine corpore, sic Christus nulli vitam confert sine unitate corporis Ecclesiae. Sed nec mysterium nostrum ullatenus in sacramento corporis Christi fit sine suo. . . .'

[7] *Ibid.* 88.

[8] *Ibid.* 90: 'in veritate substantiae'; 149: 'substantiale in sacramento.'

While abandoning the primitive Paschasian identification of the eucharistic content with the human flesh of Christ, the twelfth-century writers identified more closely the content of the sacrament with the spiritual body and soul than their eleventh-century predecessors. With Bruno of Köln and Guibert of Nogent, Alger holds that not only does the consecrated bread become flesh, but the wine becomes the soul of Christ, so that in our sacramental union with Christ the whole man is vivified in the whole Christ, the soul as well as the body.[7]

So also the problem of the ubiquity of Christ's heavenly body on different earthly altars receives more precise treatment from Alger. Every body and every creature is local, but the super-substantial body of Christ is at the same time truly in the sacrament on earth and in heaven at the right hand of the

---

[1] Hurter, xxiii. 180 : 'substantialiter et vere in sacramento corporis et sanguinis sui nobis obtulit, ut hic et ibi praesens etiam corporaliter.' *Cf.* 134.

[2] *Ibid.* 209 : 'cum omne corpus sit visibile atque palpabile, solum corpus Christi post resurrectionem mutata non substantia non corporale est sed spirituale et invisibile.'

[3] *Ibid.* 210 : 'Quod autem invisibile corpus Christi sacramentum visibilis corporis Christi dixit (Augustine) intelligibiliter tantum per exteriorem aliquam actionem, et non sensualiter, accipiendum est.'

[4] *Ibid.* 174.

[5] *Ibid.* 281.

[6] *Ibid.* 134 : 'sic Christus in sacramento panis et vini corporaliter confici, sed non personaliter uniri.'

[7] *Ibid.* 297 : 'anima autem Christi significanda esset . . . per sanguinem qui est sedes animae . . . ut sumpto corpore et anima Christi, toto Christo totus homo in anima et corpore vivificetur . . . nec caro sine sanguine, nec sanguis sine carne, jure communicatur.'

Father,[1] just as it remained whole and was yet distributed at the Supper. In its incarnate and sacramental forms it is truly in two places at once—in heaven and on earth.[2] This dual location is operated through a privilege special to the body of Christ, which has the power of being in heaven and on earth, everywhere, and in whatever manner may be pleasing to it, not passing from place to place, but remaining here where it is, and existing anywhere else that it may desire, whole and undivided, both in heaven and earth.[3] If Hugh of Langres and Durand of Troarn perceived the effective-principle or effective-cause of the real eucharistic presence in the hypostatic union of the Incarnation, Alger applies the same idea to the smaller problem of the ubiquity of Christ on many earthly altars. It is curious that the theory of the hypostatic union was never made the basis for the official medieval doctrine of Transubstantiation. In the theology of the Incarnation there existed a less artificial instrument of investigation and definition than the Aristotelean theory of substance and accidence, one which might have led to a compromise with the Berengarian criticism. The affirmation of the human nature of Christ in the hypostatic union supplied an orthodox sanction for Berengar's contention that the substance of the sacramental elements remained.

Again, although the body of Christ is divided in the sacrament, it remains whole [4] and uncorrupt.[5] Yet it appears in a twofold, if not a threefold, form.[6] But as Jerome taught, its twofold appearance as flesh and blood does not refer to the substance, but to its form.[7] The third form—the water—symbolises the mystical body or the Church, and in contrast with the bread and wine which feeds men only, the water, which the beasts also consume, represents penitent sinners as well as the righteous, who share in the mystical unity of the sacrament.[1] Moreover, while the whole body of Christ is present in each of the elements of bread and wine, a separate consecration into flesh and blood respectively takes place, in order to symbolise the broken body and shed blood of the Passion.[2]

---

[1] Hurter, xxiii. 174 : 'Quamvis enim omne corpus, omnisque creatura localis sit, de hoc tamen supersubstantiali corpore credendum est, quod eodem tempore et vere est in sacramento suo in terris et vere in coelo sedet ad dexteram Patris.'

[2] *Ibid.* 176 : 'uno loco est in coelis . . . sicut integra fuit in cœna . . . et tamen et in humana et in sacramentali forma, idem verus utrobique Christus et in coelo et in terris.'

[3] *Ibid.* 179.

[4] *Ibid.* 180 f., 184.

[5] Lib. ii. cap. 1 (*ibid.* 246 ff.).

[6] *Ibid.* 200.

[7] *Ibid.* 200 f.

Alger's theory of the sacramental process or change of the substance of the elements into the substance of flesh and blood was in harmony with the current theory of Transubstantiation.[3] He states the theory in the form of a syllogism. Whatever is changed into another thing surrenders either its accidence or substance. When the bread and wine are changed into the body and blood of Christ all the accidents remain, therefore the substance of bread and wine ceases to be.[4] The general premise that everything contains the nature and truth of those things from which it is prepared does not apply to the sacrament, which does not contain the truth and nature of those things from which it is prepared, since it contains truly and naturally the body and blood of Christ, and truly and naturally the form of its original elements.[5] Then he confuses the categories of spiritual and material. A visible body of Christ is not phantasmal. If the sacrament of Christ is prepared from a phantasy and truth, the preparation of the sacrament is neutralised, for no preparation can be effected from something and from nothing.[6] The dialecticians say that if the substance of bread and wine is changed into that of the body of Christ, its qualities, such as colour and flavour, will not be those of bread, for they must remain fundamentally with the substance of the bread. But this result is achieved in the sacrament by a miracle. God causes the accidental qualities to exist in the sacrament in themselves, a condition which is not possible in other cases.[1] So Alger really abandons the inquiry and takes refuge in miracle, and resigns himself to the current interpretation. Bread and wine are not changed into new flesh and blood by a process of creation, but into that which coexists already, the body which Christ received from the Virgin[2]—a denial of one theory of Paschasius, and an avowal of the other. The bread and wine cease to exist, save in their corporal species.[3]

---

[1] Hurter, xxiii. 287 f.; *cf.* 211 f.

[2] *Ibid.* 295.

[3] *Ibid.* 105; *cf.* 94, 100, 106. In the last of these passages he uses the expression 'mutentur secundum interiorem essentiam' (*cf.* 351, 'essentialiter'). His usual expression, following Guitmund, is 'mutari in substantia,' and its equivalents.

[4] *Ibid.* 105 f.: 'Quidquid enim mutatur in aliud, in aliquo desinit esse quod fuerat, sive substantialiter, sive accidentaliter. Sed in pane et vino cum in corpus Christi mutantur, accidentia esse non desinunt, sed omnia remanent: ergo panis et vini substantia esse desinit.' *Cf.* 110.

[5] *Ibid.* 116 f.

[6] *Ibid.* 117 f.: 'jam confectio non orit, quum ex aliqua re et nulla confectio constare non possit.'

Alger frequently defines 'sacrament' in Augustinian terms,[4] but draws a contrast between 'sacrament' and 'mystery.' A sacrament is a visible sign signifying something. A mystery is something hidden, which is signified by the sacrament. So the mystery is something hiding and hidden, and a sacrament is a thing at once signifying and signified.[5] A sacrament is not a description merely of the former, but of *both*—of the sign, and the thing signified,[6] since the term 'body of Christ' is used both of the sacrament and of its content.[7] The true body of Christ, invisible after the Resurrection, is a sacrament of the visible body in the Passion, apparently a sacrament of Himself,[8] an idea to which Lanfranc had given expression. But after all this lucubration he turns aside by saying that if the term 'body of Christ' is used of the sacrament or visible species, it is only in a nominal sense,[9] and he takes refuge in the usual distinction drawn between the sacrament as the form and other visible qualities of the bread and wine, and 'the thing of the sacrament' as the body of Christ,[10] and demands that the distinction be kept clear.[11] Both the sacrament and its real content are necessary, otherwise there would be no difference between the sacraments of the old and new dispensations. The Old Testament sacraments could not effect forgiveness of sins,[12] and so produced merely temporal results.[13] He perceives that the contrast made between sacrament and 'res sacramenti' forms a loophole for the entrance of the idea of impanation.[1] Yet the transubstantiation of bread into the body of Christ is a sufficient defence.[2] No theory of Consubstantiation is compatible with Transubstantiation.

---

[1] Hurter, xxiii. 252.
[2] *Ibid.* 135, 139.
[3] *Ibid.* 102, 132, 281.
[4] *Ibid.* 91 ff.
[5] *Ibid.* 92: 'sacramentum signum est visibile aliquid significans, mysterium vero aliquid occultum ab eo significatum . . . mysterium occultans et occultum, et sacramentum signans et signatum.'
[6] *Ibid.* 92: 'Nec solummodo sacramentum pro alterutro, id est, vel pro signo vel pro signato invenitur, sed etiam pro utroque.'
[7] *Ibid.* 92, 94 f.
[8] *Ibid.* 206 f.
[9] *Ibid.* 97, 206.
[10] *Ibid.* 94.
[11] *Ibid.* 94 f.
[12] *Ibid.* 265 ff.
[13] *Ibid.* 272.

If the Berengarian criticism drove the orthodox writers to make a thorough examination of the implications of Augustine's great distinction between 'sacramentum' and 'res,' so also Berengar influenced their treatment of symbolism. When Alger says that the priest in the Canon describes the sacraments as the body of Christ, he refers to their form which is a similitude or figure of the body.[3] When Christ is called both truth and figure, is the statement equivalent to saying that a man is body and soul? Verbally the comparison may stand, but the meaning is different. Truth and figure are not made personally one in Christ, but the body of Christ is called truth and figure, as one can speak of the truth and the portrait of a man, although the figure—bread—is more consonant with the truth of the body of Christ than a picture with a man, for it not only represents it as a sacrament, but contains it, and is substantially converted into it.[4] Yet the symbolism must be confined to the accidence of the bread and wine—beyond that point the realists would not advance towards Berengar—the actuality of the body was always present in the substance.[5] In common with other orthodox writers he sees in the ritual features of the sacrament a symbolism of the Passion,[6] yet this is rather a symbolism of action [7] than of feature.

The rest of the treatise deals with practical problems. Alger defends the use of unleavened bread by the Latin Church against the criticism of the Greeks.[8] Some of the saints condemned the sacraments of heretics,[9] but Alger expresses the liberal view that all sacraments which are properly administered [10] are valid.[11] He repudiates the teaching of

---

[1] Hurter, xxiii. 98. [2] *Ibid.* 102, 119. [3] *Ibid.* 96.
[4] *Ibid.* 100. [5] *Ibid.* 92 f., 99, 204. [6] *Ibid.* 111.
[7] *Ibid.* 199: 'figura imaginariae actionis sacrificii.'
[8] *Ibid.* 298 ff. [9] *Ibid.* 308 ff. [10] *Ibid.* 338.
[11] *Ibid.* 311: 'Sed sacramentum corporis Christi, cum nullatenus sit sine corpore Christi, si verum est apud haereticos, nullatenus est inane et falsum apud eos, quia ubicumque est sacramentum corporis Christi, ibi et Christus, qui non est inanis et falsus, sed semper verus. Si ergo sacrificium eorum est sacrilegum, cum Christus sit sacrificium, ergo Christus est sacrilegus.'

Cyprian, Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory wherever they appear to teach the contrary.[1] Although all sacraments are said to belong to the Church, the Church's function in the sacraments is not equal to that of Christ. The power of Christ makes the sacraments valid, and although their utility is conferred by the Church, that which is due to the grace of Christ cannot be affected by the merits or functions of the ministers,[2] provided they have been episcopally ordained.[3] Heretical Eucharists are therefore valid, as in the case of Baptism.[4] But having made this generous concession he tries to draw a distinction between the sacramental validity of heretical Eucharists and the general effect of grace mediated by Christ and the Holy Spirit. While the former is conceded, the latter is denied to heretics, on the ground that Christ has no effective place among those who are outside the Church. 'Neither Christ nor the Holy Spirit is present with them through grace, yet by virtue of His ubiquity (? sacramental) He is in another sense among them.'[5]

The strictures of the Fathers against heretical sacraments were really directed against illicit sacraments,[6] and these Alger defines as sacraments in which part of the words of consecration are omitted, or when heretical phrases are introduced. Such sacraments are invalid.[7] Mere carelessness or negligence or even ignorance in the use of the words of consecration is not sufficient to invalidate a Eucharist.[8] When the solemn words are not changed, but are properly used, and when the sacrament is properly administered, the perfidy of the heretics does not hinder its effectiveness, since the heretics have, and do, no otherwise than the true Church.[9] This generous sentiment is enforced with a noble admonition. We must guard against the malice of wicked men and pay attention to brotherly welfare, so that the good shall tolerate the bad, lest the unity of the Church be severed.[1] An extension of this magnanimous attitude to the 'heretic' Berengar would have solved the eucharistic question of the eleventh century, for when tested by Alger's definition, Berengar's Eucharists were valid. The influence of Berengar had broadened the outlook of the writers of the twelfth century, and possibly his lifelong persecution attracted sympathy now that he was dead. It seems clear that if a bolder attitude had been shown by Hildebrand in 1079, a response would have been met in some of the scriptoria where orthodox churchmen were writing.

---

[1] Hurter, xxiii. 308 ff., but on pp. 337, 342, etc., he appeals to Augustine and Jerome in support of his own view.

[2] *Ibid.* 314 ff.

[3] *Ibid.* 343: 'ordinatio eis mansit integra; . . . quae cum episcopalis fuerit, quis eam neget integram in sacrificando, cum integra concessa sit etiam in sacerdotes consecrando?'

[4] *Ibid.* 318, 328 ff., 343.

[5] *Ibid.* 338.

[6] *Ibid.* 352.

[7] *Ibid.* 355, 361 f.

[8] *Ibid.* 356: 'vel incuria, vel negligentia, vel ignorantia aliqua erroris verba inseruntur, non ideo sacramentum minus fieri credendum est.'

[9] *Ibid.* 362: 'Si autem solemnia verba non mutantur, sed rite proferuntur, et ipsa executio sacramenti rite perficitur, tunc haereticorum perfidia sacramenti veritatem non impedit, quia quod haeretici aliter non habent nec agunt quam vera Ecclesia.'

About 1130 Abbaud, abbot of an unknown monastery, devoted a short treatise to the question of the fraction of the eucharistic body.[2] Geiselmann [3] sees in his work the influence of Humbert's formula, but the problem was bound to arise in an era when different implications of realist doctrine increasingly attracted attention. His theory of the fraction is based upon the proceedings and words of institution. Through the medium of benediction the Lord made the bread His body. It was His own body which He broke and gave to the disciples,[4] a process rendered possible by the fact that His body already existed in an immortal condition.[5] The fraction in the Eucharist does not injure the integrity of Christ's body which is already in heaven.[6] Indeed the antinomy is solved because the body of Christ is both palpable and yet spiritual. If it came forth from the closed womb of the Virgin, it could also pass through closed doors.[7] Although this body is divided into many parts and is consumed by men, yet it remains always whole.[8]

If in the sight of God a thousand years are as one day, so with Him a thousand places are as one place. He who is always wholly present and who is everywhere, cannot come within the category of spatial extension. Local absence does not cause Him to be absent, 'local length' does not lengthen nor 'local division' divide Him. Therefore that which is locally divided before us remains whole before God.[1] Although there are two systems of reference, the body of Christ is common to them both. If a member of the human body is broken off, it dies, but when any particle of His body is broken off it not only lives, but is life to him who faithfully accepts it, and that which retains the strength of the whole can rightly be said to be the whole.[2] The eucharistic body is united in a personal union with the indestructible and indivisible deity.[3]

---

[1] Hurter, xxiii. 349.
[2] Migne, 166, 1341–1348.
[3] P. 416.
[4] Migne, 166, 1341a.
[5] *Ibid.* 1431a f.
[6] *Ibid.* 1343d.
[7] *Ibid.* 1344b.
[8] *Ibid.* 1346a.

His final argument embodies, as Geiselmann shows, the Berengarian contention that the accidence cannot be separated from the substance. Abbaud says that as the whiteness or rotundity cannot be separated from the body of Christ, so the eucharistic elements themselves are not broken, save so far as the real body is broken.[4] His argument was directed against those who alleged that the fraction took place only in the accidence. He insists that the body itself is actually broken. He declines to discuss further this aspect of the problem, but he clearly sees that the argument led to the conclusion that the body of Christ is multiple.

The fluid condition of orthodox teaching during this era is indicated by the teaching of Stephen, Bishop of Autun (d. 1139–40). Under his theory the conclusion of Abbaud would be impossible, since Stephen refused to admit a change of the elements into the divine nature. They change, said he, into a human substance.[5]

Honorius, a clerk of Ratisbon [6] (d. 1130), one of the most voluminous writers of the day, devoted a short treatise, the *Eucharistion*,[1] mainly to a discussion of this problem concerning the nature of the eucharistic body of Christ, a problem in theology which was bound to occur so soon as the doctrine of the real presence had been scientifically grounded. He also discusses the problem of its reception by unworthy recipients.

---

[1] Migne, 166, 1346b. [2] *Ibid.* 1346c. [3] *Ibid.* 1343b.

[4] *Ibid.* 1348a: 'albedinem seu rotunditatem ab ipso corpore, quod vel album vel rotundum est, separari non posse, ita ut ab ipso non fracto haec per se singulariter non frangantur.'

[5] *Ibid.* 172, 1297a: 'Inde est quod panis et vinum non transeunt in divinam naturam, sed in humanam substantiam.'

[6] *Cf.* Endres, *Honorius Augustodunensis*, p. 3 ff. Adopting the suggestion of Otto Doberentz, Endres proves that Honorius lived at Ratisbon in the Abbey of S. James, in the time of Abbot Christian (1133–53) (pp. 3–10). The name 'Augustodunensis' has no connection with Autun, but is a pseudonym inspired possibly by Charles the Great's connection with Ratisbon, or by the relations of the Abbey of S. James, Ratisbon, with Canterbury, the seat of Augustine (pp. 11–15). Amann (Vacant and Mangenot, vii. 139 ff.) contends that even if not born at Autun, he was a priest there, and migrated later to Ratisbon (p. 143). But Endres does not claim that Honorius was born at Ratisbon.

The body of Christ is threefold, consisting of the historical body of the Incarnation, the eucharistic body, and the mystical body of the Church.[2] But the three bodies are one through the medium of the Holy Spirit, which supplies the principle of union.[3] He appears to make use of the orthodox theory of the Trinitarian union. The three bodies of Christ are one through the medium of our feeding in the Eucharist, in which the body of Christ consumes the body of Christ.[4] As the body of Christ is changed corporally into the substance of our body in the Eucharist, so through this food the Church is changed into the body of Christ. But he declines the notion of an apotheosis of the communicant similar to the apotheosis of the human nature of Christ in the Incarnation, or in His hypostatic union with the Father.[5]

If the earlier writers of the twelfth century sought a theological foundation for the theory of the Eucharist in the doctrine of the Incarnation, and especially by grounding it in the divine nature of the risen Christ, it was not long before theological opinion began to see in the Eucharist the medium of the soteriological process, and so to ground it on a peculiarly western field of theology. This aspect of the doctrine was stated by no one more clearly than by Honorius of Ratisbon.[6] Through eating the fruit of the tree of knowledge man became subject to death. It was therefore necessary that by another eating he should be restored to life.[7] In order to effect this revivification it was necessary that the historical body of Christ should connect the mystical body with Himself, and this was achieved through the agency of the eucharistic body.[1] There is a personal union between the Word and the eucharistic body—an idea which Stephen of Autun was compelled to admit,[2] although he contradicted it by stressing the human substance in the union. In this union is revealed the explanation of the fact that the divinity of Christ is not augmented by the Incarnation-eucharistic process, nor is the eucharistic food made less by constant partaking. With Heriger of Lobbes he uses the conception of the Word-Flesh.[3] The Word was sown from the heart of the Father in the field of the world, like corn, and having received flesh from the pure earth of the virginal womb, it was made food for the people.[4] The body is received whole by the faithful, and remains intact in heaven.[5]

---

[1] Migne, 172, 1249–1258.

[2] *Ibid.* 1250a.

[3] *Ibid.* 1250b: 'Unde non tria sed unum corpus Spiritu sancto coadunante'; 1250c: 'et in Spiritum unum esse.'

[4] *Ibid.* 1252b: 'corpus Christi comedit corpus Christi.'

[5] *Ibid.* 1252c: 'Non tamen sic quisquam in essentiam Christi transfertur ut in persona virginis filius, vel Dei Filius jure nominetur.'

[6] 'Augustodunensis.' *Cf. supra*, p. 389 n. 6.

[7] Migne, 172, 1250c–1251a.

But Honorius also retains the old idea of an identity between the sacramental content and the flesh received from the Virgin.[6] The process is a change of substance, and he makes use of the Ambrosian terms 'commutare' and 'transformare,'[7] and of the late eleventh-century expression 'substantialiter,'[8] while he just misses the term Transubstantiation by using 'transmutatabiliter.'[9] The agent of the change is the Word,[10] and the function of the Spirit in the sacramental process is merely supplementary to that of the Word.[11]

The unworthy receive the species alone, not the virtue of the sacrament, since the latter consists of two things—on the one hand, the species and flavour of bread and wine, which are discerned externally; and on the other, the body and blood of Christ, which are perceived within, and so form the actual sacrament, which in this sense may be called a figure.[1] This was a complete inversion of the earlier distinction drawn between a sacrament and the thing of the sacrament, where the term ' sacrament ' was confined to the consecrated species. By Anselm of Laon the two notions were combined, since he defined the sacrament as the visible species, and the thing of the sacrament as the invisible content, which, in turn, was itself a sacrament or sign of the invisible heavenly bread on which the angels feed.[2]

---

[1] Migne, 172, 1250c: 'primum corpus per medium sibi tertium incorporare.'

[2] *Ibid.* 1287b: 'percipiamus Verbum caro factum.'

[3] *Ibid.* 1251b: 'Quae caro sic verbo est unita, ut carnis verbique sit una Jesu Christi persona.' *Cf.* 139, 186c, 188a–b.

[4] *Ibid.* 172, 1251b.

[5] *Ibid.* 1252a, 1253a.

[6] *Ibid.* 1251c: 'Ecce corpus de virgine generatum tenuit in manibus.' *Cf.* 1251d, 1252a, 1252d: 'non aliud quam suum substantivum de virgine genitum corpus . . . tribuit; . . et non aliud Ecclesia hodie per manus sacerdotium conficit, quod Maria genuit.'

[7] *Ibid.* 1251c, 1252d, 1255d.

[8] *Ibid.* 1255a.

[9] *Ibid.*

[10] *Ibid.* 1251c: 'verbo quo . . . transformatum.'

[11] *Ibid.* 1250a: 'Spiritu sancto consecrante ex substantia panis et vini mysterio sacerdotium quotidie conficitur.'

Another brief treatise [3] was written by Godfrey, Abbot of the famous house of Holy Trinity, Vendôme, who died in 1132. He contributes nothing new to the discussion of the doctrine, and so far as he identifies the eucharistic body with that received from the Virgin,[4] his teaching belongs to the era before Durand of Troarn. The material of the bread is changed into the nature of Christ's body,[5] but its flavour, appearance and scent are retained, because men could no more look upon the splendour of the glorified body than Peter, James and John could bear the sight of the transfigured body of Christ.[6] He upholds the Augustinian definition of the sacrament, but offers a curious interpretation of Augustine's view of reception. The unworthy receive the blessed and life-giving flesh, but only the worthy are vivified in soul through participating in the Spirit.[7]

Of all the writings included under the authorship of Hildebert, Archbishop of Tours (d. 1133–34), by Migne,[8] the only works bearing upon the Eucharist which have any claim to be considered genuine are the *Brevis Tractatus de Sacramento Altaris* and the *Liber de Expositione Missae*, and even these are regarded by some authorities as doubtful.[9] The two ' Sermones,' [10] containing the terms ' transubstantio ' and 'transubstantiare,' were written by Peter Comestor, the Chancellor of Paris, who wrote after the time of Hildebert and died in 1179. This was proved by Hauréau in 1887.[1] The *Tractatus Theologicus* was also written much later, and is derived from the *Sentences* of Hugh of S. Victor (1097–1141).[2] It is improbable that Hildebert, a pupil and admirer of Berengar,[3] took no part in the literary contest on the Eucharist, and in the absence of a final verdict against the *Brevis Tractatus* and *De Expositione Missae*, these writings may still be assigned to him.[4]

---

[1] Migne, 172, 1254d.

[2] Bliemetzrieder, p. 116 f. (*Beiträge zur Gesch. der Phil. des M.-A.*, xviii. Hefte 2–3). *Cf.* Geiselmann, 434 ff.

[3] Migne, 157, 211–214.

[4] *Ibid.* 213b.

[5] *Ibid.* 214a : ' panis et vini materiam in sui corporis naturam . . . convertit.' *Cf.* 213b.

[6] *Ibid.* 212d–213a.

[7] *Ibid.* 213c.

[8] Vol. 171.

[9] *Cf.* Hauck-Herzog, *Realencyklop.*, viii. 70 ; de Ghellinck (Vacant and Mangenot, v. 1251).

[10] Migne, 171, 776a : ' Cum profero verba Canonis, et verbum transubstantiationis. . . .'

Like Alger and Abbaud, Hildebert attempts to remove the antinomy between the location of Christ in heaven and His presence on earthly altars—a favourite problem in the first half of the twelfth century. He bases his teaching on the Incarnation, and illustrates it with a number of felicitous antitheses. As the divinity of Christ first came to us from the heavens, so now from thence comes His humanity. The Incarnation did not separate Him from His heavenly divinity, so the Eucharist does not separate Him from His heavenly humanity. As the divinity came through His humanity, so the human sacramental presence comes through His divinity. God came at the Incarnation manifestly or perceptibly through the humanity, and now the glorified humanity comes hiddenly (occulte) or imperceptibly through the divinity.[5]

If the eucharistic body of Christ is the food of the body, spirit, and mind, yet it is not disintegrated, it returns after the Eucharist to heaven, which it never really leaves.[6] Although present on different altars, it is not differentiated in time or place, it is wholly present on each altar.[7] Hildebert tries to solve the antinomy by placing the ubiquity of Christ's body in the category of spiritual being, which is uncircumscribed and can be everywhere at once, whereas its presence on any one human altar belongs to the category of space or nature. So it can be in one place in a corporal manner, but in many places in a spiritual manner.[1]

---

[1] Herzog, viii. 69; de Ghellinck (Vacant and Mangenot, v. 1251). Yet Schnitzer, p. 403 f., and Darwell Stone, i. 275, assign the *Sermo* containing the word 'Transubstantiation' to Hildebert.

[2] Herzog, viii. 70. This was shown by Liebner in 1831, and was confirmed by Denifle. But J. Besse (Vacant and Mangenot, vi. 2468) accepts the *Tractatus* as genuine. Gore, *Dissertations*, p. 266, only uses the *Brevis Tractatus* and *De Expositione Missae*.

[3] Dieudonne, *Hildebert de Lavardin*, 1898, p. 37 ff. De Ghellinck (Vacant and Mangenot, v. 1251) denies that he was a pupil of Berengar.

[4] Geiselmann makes no reference to Hildebert. Even if these two writings were not written by him, they date from the early twelfth century. He also omits intentionally Alger and Gregory of Bergamo. *Cf.* his *Vorwort*.

[5] Migne, 171, 1149c, 1150c.

[6] *Ibid.* 1150c, 1165b.

[7] *Ibid.* 1151a.

The sacramental reality is not a mere appearance, or merely a sacramental body, but the actual body of Christ.[2] Yet although this body is virtual and spiritual, it is not a personal presence.[3] The sacramental change is operated by a divine principle of action, but it does not result in the divine Spirit inhabiting anyone bodily, nor does the eucharistic body become a spirit in man.[4] The sacramental process is made possible by the hypostatic union of Godhead and manhood in Christ, which enables Him to be circumscribed in the eucharistic presence, and yet remain ubiquitous.[5] Under the influence of his old master Berengar, Hildebert tones down the rigorous definitions of orthodox realism by drawing a distinction between the nature of existing beings and their modes of existence. Christ does not exist naturally in the eucharistic body, He ' inhabits ' it in a certain spiritual ' mode.' Was he influenced by early Monarchian conceptions ? [6] The accidence of the sacrament prevents Christ from being sensibly perceived by us. The senses perceive nothing but the form of the sacrament.[7] But realism drives him to make the contradictory statement that the body of Christ is also present ' sensibly ' on account of its inherent ' sensibility.' [8] Indeed it can be said to rest only in one place on the altar, namely, where the sacrament is.[9] Thus the sacramental character of the sacramental body is twofold: firstly on account of the 'true nature of the body,' and on account of the form of the accidence; secondly it is incorporeal in relation to the act of perception, by virtue of the eucharistic 'mode of existence.'[1] But there are not two bodies,[2] and he deprecates inquiry into this problem.[3]

---

[1] Migne, 171, 1151a.

[2] *Ibid.*: ' non phantasticum sed verum, nec solum in sacramento, sed in semetipso.'

[3] *Ibid.* 1151b: ' enim corpus . . . in uno subsistens loco corporaliter et naturaliter, in pluribus tamen est spiritualiter, atque virtualiter . . . personaliter in uno tantum est loco, in ipso videlicet homine assumpto per gratiam divinae plenitudinis.'

[4] *Ibid.* 1151b.

[5] *Ibid.* 1151c: ' per unionem personae habitat circumscribiliter . . . in locis pluribus sit ad modum spiritus.'

[6] *Cf. supra*, n. 5.

[7] Migne, 171, 1151d.

[8] *Ibid.* 1151d: ' pro corporis veritate ipsum in se ipso sit sensibile. . . . Unde ipsum et sensibiliter dici potest esse ibi, et insensibiliter. Sensibiliter quidem propter veram corporis sensibilitatem.'

[9] *Ibid.* 1152a.

Hildebert admits the fact of Transubstantiation, but declines to discuss the process. How the accidents can exist without the substance is unknown. The fact of their separate existence must be accepted by faith, which profits from the failure of reason.[4] The agent of the change is the Word of God, operating through the Holy Spirit.[5] The sacrament of the bread and wine is a mystery, it is a sign of that which hides within,[6] a designation of our faith, hope, and love, and it represents the unity of the church in Christ.[7] This teaching appears in the *Sentences* attributed to Anselm of Laon.[8] As Gore remarks,[9] under the influence of Berengar the teaching of Hildebert is expressed in more spiritual terms than that of some of his contemporaries.

In the eleventh and twelfth centuries the discussion on the eucharistic question was conducted chiefly by French and Norman writers, who were the leaders of intellectual as well as practical reform. But gradually the area of activity was widened. The *Tractatus de Veritate Corporis Christi*,[10] an extensive work written by Gregory, Bishop of Bergamo, who was killed in 1146, belongs, in some important matters, to an earlier stage of the controversy. His definition of the eucharistic body, and his theory of the change, are sometimes expressed in the language of the earlier period. He expounds a threefold significance of the sacrament, which resembles the teaching of Guibert of Nogent, and his book was written to meet the revival of Berengarianism which took place during this epoch.[11] A sign of the wider theological outlook of the twelfth century is to be seen in the fact that he begins with a statement of the doctrine of God.[12] Dialectics find no place

[1] Migne, 171, 1152a.
[2] *Ibid.* 1165a.
[3] *Ibid.* 1152c.
[4] *Ibid.* 1153a–b.
[5] *Ibid.* 1168a; *cf.* 1152a–b.
[6] *Ibid.* 1167a.
[7] *Ibid.* 1166a.
[8] Bliemetzrieder, p. 116.
[9] *Dissertations*, p. 266.
[10] Hurter, xxxix.
[11] *Ibid.* 2, 7.
[12] *Ibid.* 3 ff.

in his work, and the careful attention paid by him to the significance of texts and words[1] reveals the influence of the survival of anti-dialectical prejudice in Benedictine centres.

An objection was raised against the real presence, inspired by the words ‘ The poor ye have always with you. Me ye have not always.’ Like Guibert of Nogent he counters this with the text ‘ Lo ! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.’[2] He is with us in His uncircumscribed presence through the salutary eating of His true and unique flesh,[3] which is the true body and blood of Christ,[4] in its true essence.[5] If the Lord did not actually say ‘ This do in truth of my body,’ so He did not say ‘ This do in foreshadowing my body.’ A foreshadowing or pre-symbolism was not introduced, and actuality was not excluded.[6] It is the body which was received from Mary, and yet it is not identical with the historical body. It is the same and yet not the same[7]—a conception which was used by Alger,[8] and is reminiscent of the impasse in which the author of the ‘ Athanasian ’ symbol left the doctrine of the Trinity. If individuality and power of its nature be considered, it is the same, but not when the external species of bread and wine are under consideration.[9] This is the fullest concession made by any writer of that age to the fundamental objection of Berengar, and shows that something more than mere reaction was obtained in the recoil made by orthodoxy from his teaching. Stated positively, the eucharistic body, although not visible,[10] is, according to Gregory, *ἐπιούσιον* or supersubstantial, and imparts to those who communicate properly the substance of eternal life.[11] By communion we are incorporated with His humanity, and we participate naturally, not only by faith, in His divine substance which is one with the Father.[12] The conception of communion as the effective principle of union with God recalls the teaching of Herbert of Losinga.

---

[1] Hurter, xxxix. 29.

[2] *Ibid.* 9. *Cf.* Guibert (Migne, 156, 631d).

[3] Hurter, xxxix. 10.

[4] *Ibid.* 43, 52, 81, 90.

[5] *Ibid.* 80 : ‘ vera essentia.’ *Cf.* 18 : ‘ non tantum sacramentaliter, sed etiam essentialiter.’

[6] *Ibid.* 13 : ‘ nec praefigurationem induxit, nec veritatem exclusit.’

[7] *Ibid.* 34 : ‘ Dici ergo posset ipsum et non ipsum.’

[8] *Supra*, p. 382.

[9] Hurter, xxxix. 34.

[10] *Ibid.* 114.

[11] *Ibid.* 96 f.

[12] *Ibid.* 84 : ‘ non solum fide, sed naturaliter participamus.’

In his description of the eucharistic process Gregory uses the language of Ambrose, Lanfranc, and Guitmund alike. The bread is transformed [1] into the true body of Christ, it is converted into its essence,[2] the bread and wine are substantially [3] converted. He examines seriatim the terms 'species,' 'mystery,' 'sacrament,' and 'figure,' [4] and concludes with the realist inversion of symbolism that the bread and wine are present only in similitude [5] or appearance.[6]

We have seen that Gregory makes use of the Ignatian doctrine of the *φάρμακον* or medicine of the soul, which implants the principle of eternal life.[7] So also he introduces the Greek conception of mystery derived from *μύστης*, or the Latin secretus, meaning one who is initiated into holy things. The *συμμύσται* or 'consacerdotes,' or 'consecretales,' are they who are acquainted with the secret thing. The secret or hidden thing is the mystery.[8] He also describes the more general usage of the term 'mystery,' signifying the sacrament which represents the divine Passion,[9] and also our union with Christ through the mystical sacrament.[10]

Gregory classifies three principal sacraments—Baptism, Confirmation, and the Eucharist,—and four lesser sacraments—ordination, marriage, the sacraments of Scripture, and the oath [11]—a description which shows that the era of the systematists was near. A sacrament is, as the Greeks say, something other than that which is seen,[12] a sacred thing apart from that which the senses perceive.[13] But the term has a wider range. In every sacrament three things are to be observed: the consecrated species or 'thing which is the sacrament'; [14]

---

[1] Hurter, xxxix. 17: 'transformari.'

[2] *Ibid.* 85: 'in essentiam . . . converti.'

[3] *Ibid.* 116: 'substantialiter.'

[4] *Ibid.* 39 ff.

[5] *Ibid.* 115: 'in similitudine.'

[6] *Ibid.* 41: 'species.'

[7] *Ibid.* 56: 'Ecclesiae sacramenta . . . quae in medicinam nobis tributa fuere.' *Cf.* 96.

[8] *Ibid.* 43 f.

[9] *Ibid.* 16, 21.

[10] *Ibid.* 44: 'pacis nostrae mysterium et indissolubilis unitatis.' *Cf.* 74.

[11] *Ibid.* 58.

[12] *Ibid.* 45: 'sicut graecorum sapientibus visum est.' *Cf.* 59.

[13] *Ibid.* 46.

[14] *Ibid.* 59. *Cf.* 73: 'Apparet ergo corpus et sanguinem rite existere, non tantum per id solum, quod interius veraciter esse creditur, sed per exteriorem panis vinique speciem, quae cernentium oculis repraesentantur.'

the eucharistic content or 'thing of which it is the sacrament';[1] and 'the thing which is the virtue of the sacrament.'[2] The virtue of the sacrament constitutes its utility for the Church, which is indicated by the sacramental symbolism,[3] which in turn he explains to be the uniting of the faithful in the effects of the Passion into a society and unity of brotherly peace, and this is the Church.[4]

Gregory gives several applications of the term 'figure.'[5] It is only rightly used of the Eucharist in the sense of a figure of the sacred thing, and so is equivalent to the term 'mystery.'[6] If the Eucharist is also called a figure of the Lord's Passion,[7] and of the mystical body of the Church,[8] which is not located in essence on the altar, nor actually eaten by the communicants (as Abbaud had taught), the Passion is only indicated mystically and sacramentally.[9]

Gregory's book represents a useful summary of the arguments put forward by followers of Berengar's teaching in the first half of the twelfth century. Probably to this period should be assigned the Epistle to Patrick, formerly attributed to Rather of Verona.[10] It deals with problems similar to those raised by Gregory of Bergamo which were being widely discussed at that time.

---

[1] Hurter, xxxix. 72, 73.

[2] *Ibid.* 59: 'in unoquoque sacramento tria esse distincte servanda inveniemus; rem scilicet quae sacramentum est, rem cujus sacramentum est, et rem quae virtus sacramenti est.' The careful definition of the term 'sacrament' effected through the Berengarian controversy became blurred in the twelfth century. Even Anselm of Laon, the first systematist, defined the body and blood of Christ as both 'sacrament' and 'res.' *Cf.* Geiselmann, 434 ff.

[3] Hurter, xxxix. 59 f.: 'Verum quid utilitatis Ecclesiae sacramenta videbuntur conferre, si tantummodo quaeramus, quid eorum significatione sacramentaliter innuatur, et non etiam indagemus quid in nobis sacramentorum virtute veraciter efficiatur?'

[4] *Ibid.* 78.

[5] *Ibid.* 47 f.

[6] *Ibid.* 48: 'Quamobrem si sacrae rei figura fuerit, sacramenti vocabulo recte censebitur. Itaque si de rebus sacris agant sive figura sive mysterium, jure sibi nomen vindicent sacramentorum.'

[7] *Ibid.* 38.

[8] *Ibid.* 77.

[9] *Ibid.* 79 f.

[10] Migne, 136, 643d f. *Cf.* Geiselmann, *Studien*, pp. 37–51.

CHAPTER XXII

THE SYSTEMATISTS AND THE FOURTH LATERAN COUNCIL

Towards the middle of the twelfth century a new era in medieval religious thought begins with the age of the systematists. The great teachers of western Europe embody their eucharistic teaching in the 'Sententiae' or 'Summae,' which displaced the formal treatises on specific topics of the pre-scholastic era. If we may accept the conclusion of Bliemetzrieder [1] that Anselm of Laon was the author of the *Sententiae Divine Pagine*, then the new era begins at the commencement of the twelfth century, for Anselm died in 1117. But it is possible that the *Sententiae* were compiled by one of his pupils.[2]

This period covered the first phase of the systematisation of Church doctrine, and was separated by the Lateran Council of 1215 from the age of Thomas of Aquinas, who carried the work of the Summarists to the highest pitch of its development. The influence of Berengar continued to haunt the minds of orthodox writers. Rupert of Deutz (d. 1135), in the *De Divinis Officiis*, a systematic treatise on theology and religious practice and ceremony, approaches closely to

---

[1] *Beiträge*, xviii. Hefte 2–3. De Ghellinck (*Irish Theological Quarterly*, October 1911, pp. 427–441) also assigns the *Sentences* to Anselm of Laon, but does not regard them as a work of systematisation. They were notes which formed the basis of his lectures (p. 441) and exerted no influence upon the development of the Summarists (p. 440). On the other hand, Geiselmann, p. 431, places Anselm in the line of the Sententiaries. Grabmann, *Die Gesch. der schol. Methode*, ii. 136–168, attributes the inspiration, if not the inception, of the Summarist literature of the early twelfth century to William of Champeaux and Anselm of Laon (pp. 140, 167).

[2] R. M. Martin, *Rev. d'Hist. ecclés.*, 1921, p. 395 f., is not certain that the *Sentences* are Anselm's. He awaits the appearance of the second part of Bliemetzrieder's work. B. Geyer, *Theologische Revue* (Vienna), 1923, p. 230, attributes them to a pupil of Anselm. *Cf.* Geyer, *Die Patristische und Scholastische Philosophie*, 1928, p. 204.

Berengar's teaching that the sacramental process does not involve the destruction of the substance of bread and wine. There are two substances in the sacrifice—one divine, the other earthly. The earthly substance can be seen corporally and locally. The divine substance is the invisible Word, 'which in the beginning was God, and was with God.' The Word which had accepted human nature, and which remained in the flesh, took the substance of bread and wine, and joined the bread with His flesh, and the wine with His blood.[1] This theory of impanation was severely criticised by William of S. Thierry (d. 1153), who warned Rupert that it could be interpreted as Berengarianism.[2]

In the middle of the century Folmar, Provost of Triefenstein, corresponded with Eberhard, Bishop of Bamberg, and gave expression to the views of Berengar and Ratramn.[3] Similar opinions were held by a clerk named Gerland, and were refuted by Hugh Metellus, a Canon Regular.[4] Abelard (1079–1142) admitted that the controversy over the problem whether the eucharistic bread was only a figure of the body, or was in substance actual flesh, was not closed,[5] and Abelard was described by Walter of S. Victor as another Berengar.[6] Moreover, Hugh Metellus is reported to have attributed to him teaching which was an echo of Berengar's doctrine. Peter Lombard (d. 1160) challenged the formula submitted to Berengar by Humbert in 1059. The formula had said that the actual body of Christ was broken by the hands of the priest and torn by the teeth of the faithful. To this Peter refused to assent. Only the accidents are broken and consumed, the body remains intact in heaven.[7] He was even doubtful whether the change was substantial,[1] but the Lombard takes refuge with the authorities [2] who maintain that the substance of the bread becomes that of the body and blood,[3] indeed it disappears.[4] Some of the propositions discussed by the Summarists, notably the significance of ' hic ' and ' hoc ' in the words of institution, were inspired by Berengarian teaching.[5]

---

[1] Migne, 170, 40b–c: 'in sacrificio divina substantia est et terrena. Terrena in utroque est, id quod corporaliter vel localiter videri potest: divina in utroque, verbum invisibile est "Quod in principio erat Deus apud Deum." . . . Verbum quod humanam acceperat naturam, id est in carne manens, panis et vini accipiebat substantiam vita media, panem cum sua carne, vinum cum suo jungebat sanguine.'

[2] *Ibid.* 180, 342a.

[3] *Ibid.* 194, 1481. *Cf.* Bach, i. 398.

[4] Migne, 188, 1273b ff. *Cf.* Schnitzer, p. 394 ff.

[5] Migne, 178, 1286b: 'Sed nec adhuc illam summam controversiam de sacramento altaris, utrum videlicet panis ille qui videtur figura tantum sit Dominici corporis, an etiam veritas substantiae ipsius Dominicae carnis, finem accepisse certum est.'

[6] *Ibid.* 199, 1154a–b.

[7] *Ibid.* 192, 865 (Lib. iv. Dist. xii. 5).

However, the development of the definitive statement of the doctrine of Transubstantiation continued. Before the middle of the century the verb ' transubstantiare ' appeared for the first time in the *Tractatus de Sacramento Altaris* of Stephen of Beaugé, who became Bishop of Autun,[6] and died 1139–40,[7] and the substantive ' transubstantiatio ' appears first in the ' Sententiae,' written between 1140 and 1150 by Roland Bandinelli,[8] who became Pope Alexander III. In the second half of the century the use of both verb and substantive becomes increasingly frequent,[9] and occurs especially in the anonymous *Expositio Canonis Missae*, which appeared about 1200.[1]

---

[1] Migne, 178, 861 (Lib. iv. Dist. xi. 1) : ' Si autem quaesitur qualis sit illa conversio an formalis an substantialis vel alterius generis definire non sufficio.'

[2] *Ibid.* 862 (Lib. iv. Dist. xi. 1) : ' Quibusdam esse videtur substantialis dicentibus sic substantiam converti in substantiam ut haec essentialiter fiat illa. Cui sensui praemissae auctoritates consentiri videntur.'

[3] *Ibid.* 192, 862 (Lib. iv. Dist. xi. 2).

[4] *Ibid.* (Lib. iv. Dist. xi. 3).

[5] De Ghellinck (Vacant and Mangenot, v. 1242).

[6] Migne, 172, 1291C : ' oblatio panis et vini transubstantietur in corpus et sanguinem Jesu Christi ' ; 1293C : ' Panem quem accepi in corpus meum transubstantiavi.'

[7] *Cf. supra*, p. 389. There were two Bishops of Autun named Stephen in the twelfth century. As his successor was appointed in 1186 the latter lived a generation after Stephen of Beaugé. It is not certain that the *Tractatus* should be attributed to Stephen of Beaugé, but the evidence favours him. *Cf.* de Ghellinck (Vacant and Mangenot, v. 1290) ; Gore, *Dissertations*, 268 n. 3.

[8] ' Verumtamen si necessitate imminuente, sub alterius panis specie, consecraretur, profecto fieret transubstantiatio ; sanguis autem numquam fit nisi de vino transubstantiatio,' quoted by de Ghellinck (Vacant and Mangenot, v. 1290), who assigns the statement to Bandinelli on the authority of Denifle, *Archiv für Lit. und Kirchengesch.*, i. (1885) 604, and F. A. Gietl, *Die Sentenzen Rolands Bandinelli* (1891), p. xvi. But with P. Ehrle (*Zeitschrift für Cath. Theol.*, xvi. (1892) 147 ff.), de Ghellinck does not think that Gietl's proof is conclusive. Gietl dates the *Sententiae* 1150–53 ; Ehrle suggests 1142–50 (p. 149) ; Denifle gives 1140–42.

[9] *Cf.* the analysis of de Ghellinck in Vacant and Mangenot, v. 1290–1293. ' Transubstantiatio ' and ' transubstantiare ' occur in the latter half of the twelfth century in the writings of the theologians of Paris, in sermons and correspondence, in polemical treatises and liturgical commentaries, in collections of canons and in fragments left by nuns as well as monks. De Ghellinck gives the references in the works of Adam of Petit-Pont, Bishop of S. Asaph, *c.* 1159–65 ; Stephen of Tournai before

This work answers some of the Berengarian criticisms. When the priest pronounces the words 'Hoc est corpus meum, Hic est sanguis meus,' the bread and wine are changed (convertentur) into the flesh and blood. One substance was changed into another in Old Testament times, and Christ changed water into wine, so why could He not change (mutare) bread into flesh.[2] It is less difficult to change something into another thing than to create something from nothing. The process of the change is miraculous.[3] Beneath each species of bread and wine the body and blood of Christ are consecrated.[4] Creation takes place when a natural object is constituted; sanctification occurs when it is consecrated; and a thing is rendered life-giving when it is transubstantiated.[5] Creation is a primordial cause, consecration is a sacramental cause, and vivification takes place when the bread and wine pass over into flesh and blood.[6] Through the blessing of Christ the bread is transubstantiated into flesh, and the wine is transubstantiated into blood.[7]

1159; S. Hildegarde in 1171; John of Faenza after 1171; Peter Comestor before 1175; Peter of Poitiers before 1175; Peter of Pavia in 1178; Peter of Celle before 1180; Peter of Blois *c.* 1175–95; Baldwin, Archbishop of Canterbury, before 1181; Alan of Lille after 1179; Sicard of Cremona *c.* 1185–95; Peter the Chanter; Huguccio by 1187; Innocent III before 1198, and again in a letter of 1202, etc.; Gerard le Cambrien 1199; Garnier of Rochefort, Bishop of Langres, 1208–10; Prevostin, 1200–06; Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, before 1208 (frequently); Simon of Tournai, towards the end of the century; and John the Teuton before 1215.

The dates refer to the time when the works in which the words occur were published. *Cf.* also de Ghellinck, *Recherches de science religieuse*, iii. (1912) 255 ff.

[1] De Ghellinck, *Mouvement théologique*, p. 355 ff. The *Expositio* contains passages taken from Hugh of S. Victor (d. 1141) and Innocent III (d. 1217). As the treatise of Innocent was not written before 1198, the date of the *Expositio* cannot be fixed much before 1200. *Cf.* de Ghellinck, *Recherches de science religieuse*, ii. (1911) 466 ff.; and Vacant and Mangenot, v. 1289. *Cf. supra*, p. 333 n. 4.

[2] Migne, 145, 881d.

[3] *Ibid.* 882d.

[4] *Ibid.* 883d.

[5] *Ibid.* 888a: 'Creas ergo condendo naturam; sanctificas, consecrando naturam; vivificas, transubstantiando creaturam.'

[6] *Ibid.* 888b: 'creas secundum causas primordiales; sanctificas, secundum causas sacramentales; vivificas, ut transeant in carnem et sanguinem.'

[7] *Ibid.* 889c: 'benedixit propter benedictionem panis qui transubstantiatur in carnem, et vini quod transubstantiatur in sanguinem.'

The substantive Transubstantiation appears in the writer's reply to the objection that the pronoun ' hoc ' cannot refer to the body of Christ, nor to Transubstantiation.[1] The priest does not use ' hoc ' in a figurative sense, but with express reference to the reality of the body.

This well-developed doctrine makes it impossible to date the ' Expositio ' before the time of Guitmund and the Roman Council of 1079. It was written in an era when the dogma of Transubstantiation was no longer a speculation. The reference to the characteristically Berengarian interpretation of ' hoc ' suggests a time not far removed from the controversy, although the Radbertian statement that the body of Christ begins to be in the sacrament,[2] and the use of the Ambrosian term ' conficere,' [3] reflect early realist terminology, and doubtless led to the association of the ' Expositio ' with the name of Damiani. But de Ghellinck's evidence for the date 1200 seems conclusive.

Peter of Blois (d. 1200–12), the Archdeacon of Bath,[4] addressed one of his numerous letters to Peter, a royal clerk,[5] and expressed the curious view that while the body of Christ is flesh and not spirit, it only feeds the spirit,[6] and can only be received spiritually. It exists in different places by reason of virtual and spiritual power only.[7] It was corporally and naturally present only in the incarnate body of Jesus, but by virtue of the pervading presence of the incarnate Word throughout the world, the divinity can be present on many human altars as an incomprehensible sacrament.[8] The Logos is the principle of unity for the manifold presence of the eucharistic body on human altars. The Logos is also the agent of Transubstantiation. The accidents remain in appearance without substance.[1]

---

[1] Migne, 145, 883d : ' nondum est transubstantiatio.'

[2] *Ibid.* 882d : ' incipit esse sub sacramento.'

[3] *Ibid.* 881c. *Cf.* Ambrose, *De Myst.*, iv. 14, ix. 53 (Migne, 16, 407a, 440a).

[4] Giles, i. (1847) x., gives ' 1200 or soon after ' as the date of his death. Migne, 207, col. xiv., gives 1200. Chevalier, 3694, has 1200–1212. Peter was Archdeacon of Bath 1175–*c.* 1191, Archdeacon of London *c.* 1192, Dean of Wolverhampton 1198.

[5] Giles, ii. 36 ff. (Epis. 140) ; Migne, 207, 416 ff. *Cf.* de Roye, p. 68.

[6] Migne, 207, 420d : ' Cumque corpus Christi caro sit, et non spiritus, spiritum tamen et non corpus reficit.'

[7] *Ibid.* 421a : ' in pluribus locis est virtuali potentia, et spirituali modo.'

[8] *Ibid.* 421a–b : ' ex unionis virtute, et in uno homine spiritualiter sit verbum, et in pluribus locis sit illius corporis et sanguinis incomprehensibile sacramentum.'

In the first decree of the Fourth Lateran Council, held by Innocent III, November 11–30, 1215, the term Transubstantiation received the official sanction of the Church. The decrees of this Council at once became the predominant medieval standard of Catholic belief until the appearance of the decrees of Trent (1545–63). At the Fourth Lateran Council 'the real presence obtained the same value as the Trinity and the two-nature doctrine,'[2] a development which Harnack describes as 'the most distinctive and boldest act of the Middle Ages.'[3] But this doctrine had already been registered at Rome in 1059 and 1079, and the chief contribution of the Fourth Lateran to eucharistic doctrine was the clear enunciation of Transubstantiation, nearly two generations before the *Summa* of Thomas of Aquinas (1225–74) appeared. The first decree of 1215 stated 'There is one true universal church of the faithful, outside which no one can be saved, in which Jesus Christ Himself is the priest and sacrifice, whose body and blood are truly contained in the sacrament of the altar beneath the species of bread and wine, the bread being transubstantiated into the body, and the wine into the blood,[4] by divine power, so that we receive for perfecting the mystery of unity from His very self, that which He received from us.[5] So no one can prepare this sacrament[6] save the priest, who has been properly ordained according to the keys of the Church which Jesus Christ Himself gave to the apostles and their successors.' At the thirteenth session of the Council of Trent, which assembled on October 11, 1551, the doctrine of Transubstantiation was confirmed. 'Through the consecration of bread and wine the conversion takes place of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood. Which conversion is conveniently and properly called Transubstantiation by the Holy Catholic Church.'[1] If the word does not appear in the Roman liturgy,[2] yet the Lateran decree of 1215, confirmed by the Council of Trent in 1551, marks the final refutation of Berengarianism by the Roman Church.

---

[1] Migne, 207, 420d: 'pane et vino transubstantiatis virtute verborum coelestium in corpus et sanguinem Christi, accidentia, qui prius ibi fuerant, sine subjecto remanent, et apparent.'

[2] Harnack, vi. 53.

[3] *Ibid.* vi. 54.

[4] Mirbt, *Quellen*, p. 179: 'transubstantiatis pane in corpus, et vino in sanguinem.' *Cf.* Mansi, xxii. 982; Héfélé–Leclercq, v. pt. ii. (1913) 1325.

[5] Referring to His incarnate body.

[6] Mirbt: 'sacramentum nemo potest conficere.'

---

[1] Mirbt, p. 307: 'Quae conversio convenienter et proprie . . . transubstantiatio est appellata.'

[2] *Ibid.* p. 307 n. 6. On the terminology framed by the Council of the Lateran and the Council of Trent, *cf.* Batiffol, *L'Eucharistie* (1905), p. 383.

CHAPTER XXIII

BERENGAR AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

We have seen that the teaching of Ratramn was widely spread in England during the latter part of the tenth and beginning of the eleventh centuries, through the medium of Ælfric's writings. A solid foundation had been laid for the reform of English sacramental doctrine if the work of Lanfranc had not prevented the dissemination of Berengar's teaching in England during his pontificate. Lanfranc's influence cut across the natural development of English thought, for the popularisation of Ratramnian doctrine by Ælfric represented an accommodation to English ideas, as well as an effort to reform dogma in circles where Radbertianism had taken root. If the Continental Reformation of the sixteenth century embodies a return to Augustine, the Anglican Reformation constituted a return to the simpler and more robust conceptions of the Anglo-Saxon Church, and both movements took up the strands of doctrine at points where they had been deflected from the true and natural course of development.

No trace of Berengar's teaching can be found in the writings of English theologians until the fourteenth century, partly because of the predominating influence of Lanfranc's *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, and of the decree of the Fourth Lateran Council, and partly because of the general destruction of Berengar's works. The first appreciative tribute to Berengar in England appeared in the *De Eucharistia Tractatus Major*[1] of Wyclif (d. 1384). Berengar's teaching undoubtedly influenced Wyclif towards a denial of the doctrine of Transubstantiation.[2] The substance of the bread and wine remains

[1] Loserth, *Johannis Wyclif. De Eucharistia Tractatus Major* (1892).

[2] *Cf.* Dieckhoff, i. 155. It is curious that Workman, ii. 35, thinks that Wyclif retained Transubstantiation.

after consecration.[1] The venerable sacrament is in its own nature real bread.[2] Transubstantiation cannot be established from Scripture. It is contrary to the opinions of the saints to say that there is accidence without substance in a real host, for the existence of accidence without substance is not tenable.[3] Wyclif admits the validity of the term only when it is carefully modified by symbolical terminology. The sacrament of the Eucharist is in figure the body and blood of Christ, into which the bread or wine is transubstantiated[4]—a statement in which he seems to confuse his categories.

On the doctrine of the real presence Wyclif has been charged with obscurity or inconsistency.[5] But all his sacramental writings, even the *De Eucharistia* which was published at the end of his life, are fairly consistent, particularly when it is remembered that he fell under the influence of Berengar's symbolical phraseology. Wyclif contended for a spiritual interpretation of realism. He refuted the physical phraseology of the formula of 1059,[6] and appealed to Thomas Aquinas in favour of a potential or sacramental presence of the body of Christ against the Scotists who held that the presence was localised.[7] If he uses realist language, asserting that the Eucharist has both the body and the blood of Christ really and actually in every part of it,[8] the same substance as He received from the Virgin, which suffered on the Cross, and lay dead in the tomb, rose again, and ascended into Heaven,[9] yet he carefully guards himself against orthodox definitions of the nature of the real presence. He denies that the bread is the body of Christ essentially, substantially, corporally, or identically.[10] It is a virtual, spiritual, and sacramental presence only. Substantial, corporal, or dimensional terms can refer only to the body of Christ in heaven, which does not come down to the consecrated host, but remains in heaven fixed and unmoved, so that it has spiritual, not dimensional, being in the host.[1] Its accidence is in heaven.[2]

---

[1] *Fasciculi Zizaniorum* (Rolls Ser. v.), p. 131.

[2] Lechler, *Trialogus*, p. 258 ; *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, p. 105 ; Mansi, xxvi. 695e.

[3] *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, pp. 105, 131 ; Mansi, xxvi. 695e.

[4] *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, p. 105 : 'Sacramentum eucharistiae est in figura corpus Christi et sanguis, in quae transubstantiatur panis aut vinum.'

[5] Darwell Stone, i. 368 ; Workman, *John Wyclif*, ii. 35, but Dr. Workman thinks that he was a consistent realist until the end of his life (*cf*. pp. 30 ff.), and that he upheld Transubstantiation, while uncertain of its method (p. 36).

[6] Loserth, *De Eucharistia*, Introduction III, quoting *Trialogus*, iv.

[7] Loserth, p. 232 f., 268, 271.

[8] *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, p. 105.

[9] *Ibid*. p. 115.

[10] *Ibid*. p. 115 ; Mansi, xxvi. 696a.

As his sacramental ideas matured Wyclif approximated more and more closely to Berengar's teaching on the nature of the sacrament. By virtue of the words of Christ the bread has the name of the body of Christ.[3] The consecrated elements are an effectual sign of the Lord's body.[4] In the *De Eucharistia* he deals specifically with Berengar's teaching. In the 'Confession' of 1059 Berengar could only interpret the terms 'body' and 'blood' figuratively and tropically,[5] for neither the bread nor its accidence can form the body of Christ.[6] A distinction must be drawn between what is literal and what is figurative,[7] and he condemns the popular belief that the sacramental sign of the body of Christ is actually Christ Himself as faithless and blasphemous, but contends that the clergy and bishops are involved in it.[8]

Berengar's language evidently caused him difficulty, a difficulty made worse by his own disinclination to abandon realist terminology. He alleges that Berengar corrected his original opinion and admitted that the bread and wine are both sacrament and the body and blood of Christ.[9] Berengar's 'Confession' must be rightly understood, and when properly read it has the authority of the Scriptures and the Fathers[10] and is the orthodox faith of the Church; it would have been accepted in Wyclif's own day, although it was officially condemned in Berengar's time.[11] Yet the attitude of the authorities in that era should not be questioned, otherwise the whole fabric of faith would come under suspicion.[12]

Wyclif, like Berengar, was anxious to make some concession to realist terminology—although he went much farther in the direction of a realist definition of the sacrament than the eleventh-century reformer. With Berengar he clearly affirms that if the bread and wine are a sacrament and the body and blood of Christ, they have that character in sign not in essence.[1] In one passage he gives open expression to the subjective dynamic symbolism of Berengar. The aim of the sacrament is the indwelling of Christ in the soul, so that a layman who recalls to mind the body of Christ in heaven has acquired more effectually the presence of the body of Christ than the consecrating priest, and equally really, though in a different mode.[2]

---

[1] *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, p. 115 ff. [2] Lechler, p. 272. [3] *Ibid.* p. 275.

[4] *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, p. 105. *Cf.* Loserth, p. 271.

[5] Loserth, p. 24: 'figurative vel mistice . . . locucionibus . . . intelligitur per figuram'; pp. 25, 26: 'illa sacramenti sensibilia non sunt corpus Christi et sanguis sed eorum figura'; p. 27: 'figurative'; p. 35: 'figurativum vel tropicum.'

[6] *Ibid.* p. 34. [7] *Ibid.* p. 35. [8] *Ibid.* p. 111 f. [9] *Ibid.* p. 30.

[10] *Ibid.* pp. 34 f., 38. [11] *Ibid.* p. 34. [12] *Ibid.* p. 34 f.

Wyclif criticised an impanationist interpretation of the formula of 1059, current in his own day, which stated that the species of the bread and wine were neither sacrament nor body of Christ, but contained the body of Christ beneath them.[3] He describes the *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini* of Lanfranc as 'ineffective invective,'[4] and charges Lanfranc with misrepresenting Berengar's argument,[5] and declines the necessity of a further discussion of Lanfranc's work on the ground that it refers to Berengar's opinions before 1059, and so was not relevant.[6] In spite of the futility of this contention, his attitude to Lanfranc's teaching at least proves that whatever view Wyclif held on the doctrine of the real presence, it was not that of the great orthodox writers of the Church, a conclusion which is the more necessary when it is recollected that he declined to interpret the presence 'substantialiter' in the language of Guitmund.

Little or no influence has been exerted by Wyclif upon the development of eucharistic doctrine in later times. The Hussite movement, which owed much to Wyclif's teaching in other fields of doctrine, retained the dogma of Transubstantiation, and there is no record of any important effect produced by Wyclif upon the sacramental doctrine of the English Reformers.

In 1566 the *Paschal Sermon* of Ælfric, together with extracts from other writings, was reprinted under the title *A Testimonie of Antiquity*, with an Introduction signed by Archbishop Parker of Canterbury and Archbishop Young of York, and by thirteen other bishops. Foxe printed the *Paschal Sermon* in his *Ecclesiastical History* in 1570, and many editions of the same work of Ælfric appeared between 1623 and 1827.[1] John Cosin gives an account of Ælfric's teaching in his *History of Popish Transubstantiation* (1676).[2]

---

[1] Loserth, p. 38: 'Manet ergo juxta sentenciam ecclesie in Berengario . . . in signo et non in essencia.'

[2] *Ibid.* p. 111 f.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 225. Harnack, vi. 239, thinks that Wyclif's doctrine was that of impanation. This is not upheld by Dieckhoff, i. 156.

[4] Loserth, p. 283: 'inveccione inartificiose.'

[5] *Ibid.*: 'nunc simulat falsa contra que arguit.'

[6] *Ibid.* p. 284.

Ratramn's book was reprinted in 1624, together with extracts from Rabanus Maurus and Ælfric, under the title *Three Rare Monuments of Antiquitie*. The British Museum Catalogue contains a list of sixteen English and Continental editions of this work between 1531 and 1800, which include both English and Latin versions. Ten of these appeared in Reformation times, between 1531 and 1582, four of them in England, and two notably in 1548 and 1549 respectively.[3]

The most remarkable testimony to the influence of Ratramn's work upon English eucharistic teaching comes from Ridley. He mentioned the book of 'Bertram'[4]—the name by which Ratramn was known in Reformation times in England—among the works of ancient Fathers to whom he appealed during the Disputation at Oxford on April 17, 1555.[5] 'Finally with Bertram I confess that Christ's body is in the sacrament in this respect, as he writeth, because there is in it the Spirit of Christ, that is, the power of the Word of God, which not only feedeth the soul, but also cleanseth it,' and he denies that 'we teach that the godly and faithful should receive nothing else at the Lord's Table, but a figure of the body of Christ.'[6] In contrast with the bare symbolism or memorialism of some contemporary writers,[1] he attributes to the consecrated elements a spiritual dynamic or virtue, which produces an effect upon the soul.[2]

---

[1] *Cf.* C. L. White, *Ælfric*, pp. 199–211, for editions of Ælfric's works.

[2] The book was written originally in Latin in 1657 and was published in 1675 in that tongue. *Cf.* p. 95 f., where he also refers to Ratramn.

[3] *Cf.* an abridged translation in Moule's edition of Ridley, *A Brefe Declaration of the Lordes Supper*, pp. 223–248.

[4] The variants 'Bertram' and 'Bertran' can be traced back to the eleventh century (Sigebert, *De Script. Eccles.*, Migne, 160, 569a). *Cf.* Nägle, p. 4 f.

[5] H. Christmas, *Works* (Parker Society), p. 201. On the influence of Ratramn's book in the time of the Reformation, *cf.* Nägle, p. 84 ff.

[6] Christmas, p. 202. Moule, p. 126 ff.: 'the Lordes wordes wherby he instituted the sacrament of his bloude, he useth a figurative speache.' Augustine understood the words figuratively.

Ridley's theory of symbolism springs from the Augustinian principle that a sacrament must have the similitude or likeness of the thing of which it is a sacrament. He emphasises its dynamic character by making use of the three traditional principles of value, union, and faith. 'This similitude in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is taken in three manner of ways.' It 'nourishes'—and Bertram is again quoted—it unites and joins many in one, and causes those who by faith make the right use of the sacrament to become the body of Christ.[3] The designation 'body and blood' is 'figurative speech,' as the Fathers declare, and 'most plainly Bertram.'[4] The natural substance of bread and wine is the true natural substance of the holy sacrament of the blessed body and blood.[5]

To the proposition that 'after the consecration there remaineth no substance of bread and wine, neither any other substance than the substance of God and man,' Ridley replied: 'We may no more believe the bread to be transubstantiated into the body of Christ than wine into His blood.'[6] He closed his defence with a glowing tribute to Ratramn: 'This treatise whosoever shall read and weigh, considering the time of the writer, his learning, godliness of life, the allegations of the ancient fathers, and his manifold and most guarded arguments, I cannot (doubtless) but much marvel, if he have any fear of God at all, how he can, with good conscience, speak against him in the matter of the sacrament. This Bertram was the first that brought me from the common error of the Romish Church, and caused me to search more diligently both the Scriptures and the writings of the old ecclesiastical fathers in this matter.'[7]

---

[1] Cf. *A Brefe Declaration*, written 1555 (Moule, p. 104): 'such thus doo make the holy Sacramente of the blessed body and bloud of Christ nothing elles, but a bare sygne or a figure.' *Cf.* p. 105.

[2] *Cf.* Moule, p. 111. The body of Christ is present in the form of grace, like the beams of the sun which remains in the heavens.

[3] Christmas, p. 205; Moule, p. 101.

[4] Christmas, p. 205. [5] Moule, pp. 114 ff., 110 ff.; Christmas, p. 202 ff.

[6] Christmas, p. 204. *Cf.* Moule, pp. 106 ff., 118.

[7] Christmas, p. 206; *cf.* p. 211.

At his formal degradation at Oxford on October 15, 1555, the day before he was martyred, ' in the town ditch ' opposite Balliol College, Ridley urged Brookes, the Bishop of Gloucester and Master of Balliol, to ' read and peruse the little book of Bertram's doings concerning the sacrament.'[1] Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester, who went to the fire in the same year, described Berengar as 'a good and godly man . . . who taught and wrote that the corporal presence of Christ's body could not be in the sacrament. . . . Against the which error one John Scot and one Bertram wrote a book of the same matter. . . .' But he over-emphasises the part played by Lanfranc in Berengar's condemnation.[2]

Some twenty years earlier the reactionary Bishop Fisher of Rochester criticised severely Berengar's teaching, and compared it with that of Œcolampadius.[3] He notes that Berengar was compelled to accept the orthodox belief by Nicholas II in 1059, and quotes the Confession,[4] a detail to which Cranmer drew attention in 1550, although Cranmer condemned the doctrine of the ' sensible ' presence of Christ maintained by the oath, and pointed out that Berengar ' was constrained ' to make the confession.[5] John Sutton, Canon of Worcester and Lincoln (1565–1629), in his *Godly Meditation on the most Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper* (1630), refers to the Berengarian controversy, but declines to discuss it.[6] The French writer Rotier attacked Berengar's teaching, but the work is of little value.[7]

Among the Elizabethan divines, Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury (1560–71), defended John the Scot, Ratramn, and Berengar against Harding the Roman controversialist. Berengar's teaching, said Jewel, was that of ' Christ himself and his apostles.' He refers to the oath of 1059, and draws attention to Bertram's teaching.[1]

---

[1] Christmas, p. 290.

[2] Cf. *Early Writings*, pp. 118, 124, 230, 524 (S. Carr, *Parker Society*, 1843).

[3] *De Veritate Corporis Christi in Eucharistia . . . adversum Johannem Œcolampadium* (Cologne, 1527), lib. i. cap. 1b, 2b, 27c ; Prologue to lib. iiie ; Prologue to lib. ive.

[4] *De Veritate Corporis Christi in Eucharistia . . . adversum Johannem Œcolampadium* (Cologne, 1527), lib. iii. cap. 5.

[5] *Defence of the True Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Our Saviour Christ* (first published 1550), Wace's 2nd edition (1928), p. 31.

[6] *Cf.* Darwell Stone, ii. 292. Sutton's chronology for Berengar is, of course, wrong.

[7] *L'Histoire de Berengarius* (1566).

Among the Caroline divines, John Cosin, Bishop of Durham (1660–72), paid a tribute to Ratramn, John the Scot, and Berengar.[2] Cosin's book was probably the first publication in English to estimate favourably the teaching of Berengar.[3] He says that Berengar

> stood up valiantly in defence of that which 170 (*sic*) years before, was delivered out of God's Word and the holy Fathers, in France by Bertram, and John Erigena, and by others elsewhere, against those who taught that in the Eucharist neither Bread nor Wine remained after the Consecration. Yet he did not either believe or teach (as many falsely and shamelessly have imputed to him) that nothing more is received in the Lord's Supper, but bare Signs only, or meer Bread and Wine; but he believed and openly profest, as S. Austin and other faithful Doctors of the Church had taught out of God's Word, that in this Mystery, the souls of the faithful are truly fed by the true Body and Blood of Christ to life eternal. Nevertheless it was neither in his mind nor his doctrine, that the substance of the Bread and Wine is reduced to nothing, or changed into the substance of the natural Body of Christ or (as some of them would have the Church believe) that Christ himself comes down carnally from heaven.[4]

The vague realism which Cosin sees in Berengar's teaching is counterbalanced by another passage in which the Bishop of Durham connects Berengar's theory with Augustinian symbolism: 'He did not therefore by this his Doctrine exclude the Body of Christ from the Sacrament, but in its right administration he joyned together the thing signified with the sacred Sign, and taught that the Body of Christ was not eaten with the mouth in a carnal way, but with the Mind Soul and Spirit.'[5]

Whether a backward or forward view be taken from the eleventh century, the position of Berengar will be found to be not that of an isolated heretic in the stream of tradition. Springing from the source of Augustine's teaching, gathering force and momentum during the two preceding centuries, continuing with less impulse, indeed, during the twelfth century, but always creating an impression, coming into notice again in the era preceding the Reformation,[1] the eucharistic teaching of Berengar formed a peak in a long line of development. To-day there are not wanting signs that his theory of dynamic-symbolism, expressed not in the terms of virtue or effectiveness, but of value,[2] will come again into its own. The medieval theory of Transubstantiation has long been abandoned by philosophic thought, and the doctrine of realism, of a presence in or with the consecrated elements is definitely losing ground among Catholic thinkers.[3] Modern thought is moving towards a new interpretation of symbolism. In the doctrine of Berengar, derived philosophically from Neo-Platonism, theologically from Augustine, a foundation can be found upon which to create a new interpretation of eucharistic symbolism, centring round the Berengarian conception of the religious value or effect—the dynamic influence of the consecrated symbol upon the believing communicant. So the great Reformation doctrine of Faith, which is also being re-emphasised,[4] will be given its true function in sacramental doctrine.

---

[1] Cf. *Works*, i. 193, 458, 546, 563, 577 (J. Ayre, *Parker Society*, 1845).

[2] *A History of Popish Transubstantiation* (1676), pp. 84, 90 ff., 129.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 128–138.

[4] Cosin, p. 129 f.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 131.

---

[1] Cf. *Revue Bénédictine*, xx. (1903) 97.

[2] Temple, *Christus Veritas*, pp. 240 f., 247 f.

[3] *Cf*. Temple, *Christus Veritas* (1924), pp. 237–252; W. Spens in *Essays Catholic and Critical* (ed. E. G. Selwyn, 1926), p. 428 ff.; O. Quick, *The Christian Sacraments* (1928), pp. 185–228; Archdeacon Lilley, *Sacraments* (1928), pp. 109–126.

[4] *Cf*. Carl Barth, *Der Romerbrief* (1919); *Das Wort Gottes und die Theologie* (1925), Eng. trans. by D. Horton entitled *The Word of God and the Word of Man* (1928).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

M. = Migne, ‘Patrologia Latina.’

I. Historical.

(a) *Early Sources.*

Adelmann. ‘De Veritate Corporis et Sanguinis Domini ad Berengariam Epistola.’ C. A. Schmid; M. **143**, 1289–1296; Heurtevent, ‘Durand de Troarn,’ Appendix I.
  Verses. Martène et Durand, iv. 113.
Ægidius Aureæ Vallis (in ‘Gesta Pontificum Leodiensium,’ ii. J. Chapeauville, 1613).
‘Andegavense—Breve Chronicon.’ Martène et Durand, iii. 1381.
‘Anselmi Historia dedicationis Ecclesiae S. Remigii Remensis.’ M. **142**, 1415 ff.
Ascelin. ‘Epistle to Berengar.’ M. **150**, 67 f.
‘Beccense—Chronicon.’ M. **150**, 639 ff.
Berengar. ‘De Sacra Cœna.’ A. F. and F. Th. Vischer (1834).
  Extracts from lost ‘Opusculum’ in Lanfranc, ‘De Corpore et Sanguine Domini.’ M. **150**, 409 ff.
  ‘Acta Concilii Romani.’ Martène et Durand, iv. 103–109.
  Epistles. Sudendorf, ‘Berengarius Turonensis’ (1850).
  Epistle to Adelmann. Martène et Durand, iv. 109–113.
  Epistle to Ascelin. M. **150**, 66.
  Epistle to Lanfranc. M. **150**, 63. Giles, ‘Op. Lanfranci,’ i. 17.
  Epistle to Richard. D’Achery, ‘Spicilegium,’ iii. 400; Giles, ‘Op. Lanfranci,’ i. 18; Sudendorf, ‘Berengarius Turonensis,’ 211 f.
  Epistle to William the Treasurer. Mabillon, ‘Acta,’ vi. Pt. ii., Praef. 22.
  Epistle to the Hermits. Martène et Durand, i. 191 ff.
  ‘Juste Judex.’ Martène et Durand, iv. 115; F. J. Mone, ‘Lateinische Hymnen des Mittelalters,’ i. (1853) 359 f.; J. Ébersolt, ‘Revue d’histoire des Religions,’ xliii. (1903) 153; C. Blume und G. M. Dreves, ‘Ein Jahrtausend lateinischer Hymnendichtung,’ i. (1909) 176.
Bernold of Constance. ‘Chronicon.’ Pertz, ‘M.G.H., SS.,’ v. 426 ff.; M. **148**, 1363 ff.
  ‘De Berengarii haeresiarchae damnatione multiplici tractatus.’ M. **148**, 1453 ff.; Bouquet, xi. 527 ff.; Rieberer, ‘Raccolta Ferrarese,’ xxi.

‘ Bertini—Chronicon S.’ Martène et Durand, iii. 577 ff.

Bertrand de Brousillon, A. ‘ La Maison de Craon, 1050–1480, étude historique accompagnée du Cartulaire du Craon ’ (1893).

Bertrand de Brousillon, A., et Lelong, E. ‘ Cartulaire de l’abbaye de Saint Aubin d’Angers ’ (1903).

Bishop, Edmund. ‘ Unedierte Briefe zur Geschichte Berengars von Tours ’ (‘ Görresgesellschaft Historisches Jahrbuch,’ i. (Bonn, 1880) 272 ff.).

Boretius, A. ‘ Capitularia Regum Francorum,’ i. (1883) (‘ Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Leges,’ ii.).

Bouquet, M. ‘ Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France,’ x. (1760) 443 ff. ; xi. (1767) 23 ff., 30, 160 ff., 169, 203, 271, 284, 295, 344 f., 349, 354, 358, 382, 430, 522 f., 527 ff. ; xii. (1781) 279, 401, 459 f., 461, 465, 664 ; xiii. (1786) 620, 671 ; xiv. (1806) 791.

Bourassé, J. J. ‘ Cartulaire de Cormery ’ (‘ Mémoires de la Société archéologique de Touraine,’ xii.), 1861.

‘ Martyrologium Usuardi ad usum Ecclesiae Turonensis ’ (*Ibid.* xvii.), 1865.

Bromton, J. (R. Twysden, ‘ Historiae Anglicanae Scriptores Decem,’ 1652.)

Busson, G., and Ledru, A. ‘ Actus Pontificum Cenomannis ’ (‘ Archives historiques du Maine,’ ii.), 1909.

‘ Nécrologie-Obituaire de la Cathédrale du Mans ’ (*Ibid.* vii.), 1906.

Chantelou, C. (*Cf.* Nobilleau.)

Chapeauville, J. (*Cf.* Ægidius Aureæ Vallis.)

Chevalier, C. ‘ Cartulaire de l’abbaye de Noyers ’ (‘ Mémoires de la Société archéologique de Touraine,’ xxii.), 1872.

Chevalier, C. U. J. ‘ Les fouilles de S. Martin de Tours ’ (1888).

‘ Répertoire des Sources historiques du Moyen Âge—Bio-Bibliographie ’ (1905–7).

Crispin, Milo. ‘ Vita Lanfranci.’ Giles, i. 260 ff. ; M. **150,** 29 ff.

Cronica (various). (*Cf.* Bouquet, Halphen, Marchegay, Merlet, Pertz, Salmon, Sammarthan, and the list in Sudendorf, p. 65 ff.)

D’Achery, L. ‘ Spicilegium,’ ii. and iii. (1723).

Dümmler, E. ‘ Epistolae Karolini Ævi,’ ii. (1895) (‘ Monumenta Germaniae Historica ’).

Durand of Troarn. ‘ De Corpore et Sanguine Domini.’ Pars nona. M. **149,** 1421 ff.

Eckhart, J. G. ‘ Udalrici Bambergensis Codex Epistolaris ’ (‘ Corpus Historicum Medii Ævi,’ ii. (1723) 170).

‘ Elnonensi S. Amandi—Breve Chronicon.’ Martène et Durand, iii. 1396.

Eusebius Bruno. ‘ Epistle to Berengar.’ M. **147,** 1199 ff. ; de Roye, 48 ff. ; Semisch, ‘ Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie,’ xvii. (1857) 158 ff.

Fabricius, J. A. ‘ Bibliotheca Latina Mediae et Infimae Aetatis,’ i. (1754) 211 ff.

Francke, K. ‘ Zur Characteristik des Cardinals Humbert von Silva Candida ’ (‘ Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für altere deutsche Geschichtekunde,’ vii. (Hanover, 1881) 614 ff.).

FROLLANT OF SENLIS. ‘Epistola ad Berengarium.’ M. **143,** 1369 ff.

FULBERT OF CHARTRES. M. **141,** 199–204.

GILES, J. A. ‘Opera Omnia Lanfranci’ (1844) (in ‘Patres Ecclesiae Anglicanae’).

GOLDAST, M. ‘Vita Hildebrandi in Apologia pro Henrico IV adv. Gregorium VII’ (‘Pro Replicatio Sac. Caesarie et Regia Francorum Majestate’), 1611.

GOZECHIN. ‘Epistola ad Valcherum.’ M. **143,** 885 ff.

GRADENIGO, C. G. ‘Brixia Sacra’ (‘Pontificum Brixonicorum Series’), 1755.

GUÉRARD, M. ‘Cartulaire de l’abbaye de Saint Père de Chartres’ (‘Documents Inédits,’ i.), 1840.

‘Cartulaire de l’abbaye de Saint Bertin’ (Sithiensis) (‘Doc. Inédits,’ iii.), 1840.

‘Cartulaire de l’Église Notre-Dame de Paris’ (‘Doc. Inédits,’ iv.), 1850.

GUITMUND OF AVERSA. ‘De Corporis et Sanguinis Christi Veritate.’ H. Hurter, ‘Sanctorum Patrum Opuscula Selecta,’ xxxviii. (1879); M. **149,** 1427 ff.

HALPHEN, L., and POUPARDIN, R. ‘Chroniques des Comtes d’Anjou’ (1913).

HÉLINAND OF FROIDMONT. ‘Chronicon.’ M. **212,** 946.

HENRY OF KNIGHTON. ‘Chronicon,’ i. (J. R. Lumby. Rolls Series, No. 92, 1889).

HIGDEN, R. ‘Polychronicon’ (C. Babington. Rolls Series, No. 41, 1865).

HUGH OF LANGRES. ‘Tractatus de Corpore et Sanguine Christi contra Berengarium.’ M. **142,** 1325 ff.

HUGH METELLUS. ‘Epistle to Gerland.’ M. **188,** 1273.

HUMBERT. ‘Epistle to Eusebius Bruno’ (‘Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für altere deutsche Geschichtekunde,’ vii. (1881) 614 ff.; Brucker, ‘L’Alsace et l’Église,’ ii. 393 ff.).

JAFFÉ, P. ‘Monumenta Gregoriana’ (1865).

JAFFÉ, P., LÖWENFELD, S., WATTERBACH, W. ‘Regesta Pontificum Romanorum’ (1881–88).

JOHN OF AVRANCHES. ‘Liber de Officiis Ecclesiasticis ad Maurilium Rotomagensem Archiepiscopum.’ M. **147,** 27 f.

LANFRANC. ‘De Corpore et Sanguine Domini.’ M. **150,** 407 ff.; Giles, ‘Opera Omnia Lanfranci,’ ii. 147 ff.

‘Epistolae.’ Giles, i. 27 (Ep. 5); 72 (Ep. 56); M. **150,** 543 (Ep. 50).

LEPELLETIER, L. ‘Breviculum Fundationis S. Nicolai Andegavense’ (1616).

LEPINOIS, E. DE, and MERLET, L. ‘Cartulaire de Notre Dame de Chartres’ (1865).

MAAN, J. ‘Sancta et Metropolitana Ecclesia Turonensis’ (1667).

MABILLE, E. ‘Pancarte Noir’ (‘Mémoires de la Soc. archéol. de Touraine,’ xvii., 1865).

‘Cartulaire de Marmoutier pour le Dunois’ (1874).

MABILLON, J. ‘Acta SS. Ord. S. Benedicti Saec.,’ VI. Pt. ii. (1701). Praefatio.

‘Annales,’ ii. (1704); iv. (1707); v. (1713).

Mabillon, J. ‘Vetera Analecta’ (1723).

‘Iter Italicum Litterarium’ (‘Museum Italicum,’ i. Pt. i), 1687.

Maitre, L., and Berthon, P. de. ‘Cartulaire de l’abbaye de Croix de Quimperlé’ (1902).

Mansi, J. D. ‘Sacrorum Conciliorum Collectio,’ xix. (1774); xx. (1775).

Marchegay, P. ‘Cartularium Sancti Mauri’ (‘Archives d’Anjou,’ i.), 1843.

‘Cartulaire du Ronceray’ (‘Archives d’Anjou,’ iii.), 1854.

Marchegay, P., and Mabille, E. ‘Chroniques des Églises d’Anjou’ (1869).

Martène, E., and Durand, U. ‘Thesaurus novus anecdotorum,’ i., iii., iv. (1717).

Matthew Paris. ‘Historia Major,’ ii. (H. R. Luard. Rolls Series, No. 57, 1874).

Maurilius of Rouen. ‘Vita,’ cap. xi. M. **143,** 1382 f.

Mellicensis (Anonymous). ‘De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis.’ M. **231,** 978 f.

Merlet, L. ‘Histoire de l’abbaye de Notre Dame de Coulombs’ (1864).

Merlet, R. ‘La Chronique de Nantes’ (1896).

Merlet, R., and Clerval, A. ‘Un Manuscrit chartrain du XI^{e} siècle’ (1893).

Métais, C. ‘Cartulaire Blesois (de) Marmoutier’ (1889–91).

‘Cartulaire Saintongeais de la Trinité de Vendôme’ (Archives historiques de la Saintonge et de l’Annis,’ xxii.), 1893.

‘Cartulaire de l’abbaye cardinale de la Trinité de Vendôme’ (1893–1904).

Migne. ‘Patrologia Latina,’ **148,** 807 ff. (on the Roman Councils, 1078–79).

Mirbt, C. ‘Quellen zur Geschichte des Papstums und des römischen Katholizismus’ (1924).

Muratori, L. A. ‘Italica Sacra,’ iii. (‘Rerum Italicarum Scriptores,’ vi., 1725).

Nobilleau, P. ‘Cartulaire, Touraingeau’ (C. Chantelou), 1879.

Orderic Vitalis. Le Prévost, ii. 1840. M. **188.**

Paulus Metensi. ‘Epistola ad Berengarium.’ Martène et Durand, i. 196.

Pertz, G. H. ‘Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores,’ v. (1844) 20, 317, 387, 427; vi. (1844) 203; vii. (1846) 195, 238, 728; viii. (1848) 75, 443; x. (1852) 493; xxiii. (1874) 99, 789; xxiv. (1879) 170, 246.

‘M.G.H. Leges,’ ii. (1837), 51 f.

Peter the Deacon. ‘Chronica Mon. Casinensis.’ M. **173,** 766, 1033; Pertz, ‘M.G.H., SS.,’ vii. 728.

Peter Pisani. ‘Vita Hildebrandi.’ (*Cf.* Goldast and Watterich.)

Peter the Venerable. ‘Tractatus contra Petrobrusianos.’ M. **189,** 788 f.

Planchenault, A. ‘Cartulaire du Chapitre de Saint Laud d’Angers’ (‘Documents historiques sur l’Anjou. Société d’agriculture, sciences et arts d’Anjou,’ iv., 1903).

Porée, A. A. ‘Chronique du Bec’ (1883).

Salmon, A. ‘Le Livre des Serfs de l’abbaye de Marmoutier’ (1845).

‘Recueil de Chroniques de Touraine’ (1854).

Sammarthan, D. ‘Gallia Christiana,’ ii. (1720) 804; viii. (1744) 1116; xi. (1759), 836, 871; xiii. (1785) 807; xiv. (1856) 61 f., 65, 156, 165, 174, 188, 377, 559 f., 587, 608.

Schmid, C. A. ‘Adelmanni Brixiae Episcopi de Veritate Corporis et Sanguinis Domini ad Berengarium Epistola’ (1770).

Sigebert of Gembloux. ‘Liber de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis.’ M. **160**, 582 ff.

‘Chronica.’ M. **160**, 210, 404 f.; Pertz, ‘M.G.H., SS.,’ vi. 359, 471.

Sudendorf, H. ‘Berengarius Turonensis oder eine Sammlung ihn betreffenden Briefe’ (1850).

Theoduin (Dietwin) of Liège. ‘Epistle to Henry I.’ M. **146**, 1439 f.

Trémault, M. de. ‘Cartulaire de Marmoutier pour le Vendomoise’ (1893).

Urseau, C. ‘Cartulaire noir de la Cathédrale d’Angers’ (1908).

Watterich, J. M. ‘Pontificum Romanorum,’ i. (1862).

William of Malmesbury. ‘Gesta Regum.’ (W. Stubbs, Rolls Series, No. 90, 1887.)

Wolfelm. ‘De Sacramento Eucharistiae contra errores Berengarii.’ M. **154**, 412 ff.; Pertz, ‘M.G.H., SS.,’ xii. 185 ff.

(b) *Modern Literature.*

[Works indicated by an asterisk * have not been consulted.]

Alexander, Natalis. ‘Historia Ecclesiastica,’ vi. (1714), 661–675.

Ampère, J. J. ‘Histoire Littéraire de la France avant le douzième siècle,’ ii. and iii. (1839).

*Anglade. ‘Controverse sur l’eucharistie pendant le XI^{e} siècle’ (Paris), 1858.

‘Anjou historique, L’,’ ii. (1901) 3 ff.; ‘Béranger de Tours (998–1088), a répandu ses erreurs â Angers.’

Atchley, C. ‘The Date of “de Sacramentis”’ (‘The Journal of Theological Studies,’ April 1929).

Baronius, C. ‘Annales Ecclesiastici,’ xvii. (1745).

Basnage de Beauval, J. ‘Histoire de l’Église,’ ii. (1699).

Bastgen, H. ‘Das Capitulare Karls d. Gr. über die Bilder oder die sogenannten libri Carolini’ (‘Neues Archiv,’ xxxvi. (1911) 329 ff.; xxxvii. (1911–12) 13 ff., 453 ff.

*Behrens, Nic. Dassovius D. ‘Dissertatio carolina, sistens haeresiam Berengarianam.’ Greifswald (Pommerania).

Besse, J. M. ‘Province ecclésiastique de Tours’ (‘Archives de la France monastique,’ xix., 1920).

Bett, H. ‘Johannes Scotus Erigena’ (1925).

Biginelli, L. ‘La Rinascenza degli Studi Eucaristica nel medio evi in occasione dell’ eresia di Berengarii sulla Prasenza Reale’ (Quatrième congrès scientifique internationale des Catholiques, Fribourg-Suisse, 1898, pp. 19 ff.).

Böhmer, H. ‘Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie im xi and xii Jahrhundert’ (1899).

‘Guitmund.’ Hauck-Herzog, ‘Realencyklopädie,’ vii. 233 ff.

Boissonnot, H. ‘Histoire et description de la Cathédrale de Tours’ (1920).

Boulay, C. E. du (Bulæus). ‘Historia Universitatis Parisiensis,’ i. (1665).

Bourgain, L. ‘Une légende: l’hérésiarque Bérenger et le tertre Saint-Laurent d’Angers,’ Angers (1901).

Bowden, J. W. ‘The Life and Pontificate of Gregory VII’ (1840).

Bröcking, W. ‘Die französische Politik Papst Leos IX’ (1891).

‘Ergänzungsheft’ (1899).

‘Die Lossagung des Bischofs Eusebius von Angers von Berengar von Tours’ (‘Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft,’ v. (1891) 361 ff.; vi. (1891) 232).

‘Berengar von Tours nach der römischen Synode des Jahres 1079’ (‘Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,’ xiii. (1892) 168 ff.).

‘Die Abfassungszeit des Berengarischen Traktats, „De S. Cœna”’ (*Ibid.* 177 ff.).

‘Bischof Eusebius Bruno von Angers und Berengar von Tours’ (‘Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft,’ xii. (1895) 344 ff.).

Brossier, G. M. ‘L’Archidiacre Bérenger et l’institution de la Fête-Dieu’: Marchegay, ‘Revue des provinces de l’Ouest,’ v. (1857) 86 ff.

Brucker, P. P. ‘L’Alsace et l’Église au temps de Pape Saint Léon IX,’ ii. (1889).

‘Cambridge Medieval History,’ iii. (1922); v. (1926).

Carlyle, A. J. ‘A History of Medieval Political Theory in the West,’ ii. (1909); iii. (1915); iv. (1922).

Ceillier, R. ‘Histoire Générale des Auteurs sacrés et ecclésiastiques,’ xx. (1757).

‘Christian Remembrancer, The’ (April 1866), p. 311 ff.

Clerval, A. ‘Les Écoles de Chartres au Moyen Âge’ (1895) (Soc. archéol. d’Eure-et-Loire, vol. xi.).

Corblet, J. ‘Histoire dogmatique, liturgique, et archéologique du Sacrament de l’Eucharistie,’ ii. (1886).

Crozals, J. de. ‘Lanfranc Archevêque de Cantorbéry’ (1877).

Dammann, A. ‘Der Sieg Heinrichs IV in Kanossa,’ i. and ii. (1907–09).

Deanesly, Margaret. ‘Medieval Schools to 1300’ (‘Camb. Med. Hist.,’ v. 765 ff.).

Delarc, O. ‘Les Origines de l’hérésie de Bérenger’ (‘Revue des Questions historiques,’ xx. (1876) 115 ff.). Also published under the title ‘Un Pape Alsacien’ (1876).

‘Le Pontificat de Nicholas II’ (‘Revue des Questions historiques,’ xl. (1886) 375 ff.).

‘Saint Grégoire VII et la Réforme de l’Église au XI^{e} siècle’ (1889).

Delisle, L. ‘Canons du Concile tenu à Lisieux en 1064’ (‘Journal des Savants,’ 1901, p. 516 ff.).

DELVIGNE, A. ‘Bérenger, archidiacre de Tours, étude sur le XI^e siècle’ (‘La Vérité historique, Revue Hebdomadaire,’ iii. (1859) 168 ff., 197 ff., 236 ff., 292 ff.; iv. (1859) 73 ff. Translated from *De Katholiek*, The Hague, 1858-9.

‘Dictionary of National Biography.’ Articles ‘Ælfric,’ ‘Lanfranc.’

DÖLLINGER, J. J. T. VON. ‘Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte,’ i. (1843), 372 ff.

DREHMAN, J. ‘Papst Leo IX und die Simonie’ (‘Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte des Mittelalters.’ Heft 2. 1908).

DUBRUEIL-CHAMBARDEL, L. ‘Les médicines dans l’Ouest de la France aux XI^e et XII^e siècles’ (‘Études sur la médecin en France du X^e au XII^e siècles (1917)’).

ÉBERSOLT, J. ‘Essai sur Bérenger de Tours et la controversie sacramentaire au XI^e siècle’ (‘Revue de l’histoire des religions,’ xlviii. (1903) 1 ff., 137 ff.).

‘Ecrivains de l’Ordre de Saint Benoît,’ ii. (1717) 539.

ELLIES-DUPIN, L. ‘Histoire des Controverses et des Matières Ecclésiastiques. XI^e siècle’ (1699), 20 ff.

‘Encyclopaedia Britannica.’ Articles ‘Ælfric,’ ‘Berengar,’ ‘Lanfranc.’

FAIVRE, E. ‘La Question de l’Autorité au Moyen-Âge. Bérenger de Tours’ (1890).

FLICHE, A. ‘La Réforme grégorienne’ (‘Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense.’ Fasc. 6. 1924).

GARDNER, ALICE. ‘Studies in John the Scot’ (1900).

GFRÖRER, A. F. ‘Allgemeine Kirchengeschichte,’ iii., iv. (1846).
‘Papst Gregorius und sein Zeitalter’ (1859–64), i. 600 ff.; iii. 270 ff.; iv. 143; vi. 611 ff., 629 ff., 640 ff., 721 f.; vii. 681 f., 685 f.

GIESEBRECHT, W. VON. ‘Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit,’ ii. (1875).

GIESELER, J. C. L. ‘Kirchengeschichte,’ ii. (1829–31).

HALFMANN, H. ‘Cardinal Humbert sein Leben und seine Werke’ (1883).

HALPHEN, L. ‘Le Comté d’Anjou au XI^e siècle’ (1906).

HAUCK-HERZOG. ‘Realencyklopädie,’ ii. (1897) 609 ff.

HAURÉAU, B. ‘Histoire de Philosophie scolastique,’ i. (1872).

HÉBERT-DUPERRON, V. ‘De Venerabilis Hildeberti . . . . Vita et Scriptis’ (1855), 233 ff.

HÉFÉLÉ, C. J. VON. ‘Der heilige Paschasius Radbertus’ (‘Theologische Quartalschrift.’ Tübingen, xlv. (1863) 359 ff.).

HÉFÉLÉ, C. J. VON, and LECLERCQ, H. ‘Histoire des Conciles,’ iv. Pt. ii. (1911); v. Pt. i. (1912).

HEITZ, T. ‘Essai historique sur les rapports entre la Philosophie et la Foi de Bérenger de Tours à S. Thomas d’Aquin’ (1909).

HEURTEVENT, R. ‘Durand de Troarn et les Origines de l’Hérésie bérengarienne’ (1912).

HILGENFELD, A. ‘Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie’ (1881), 253 ff.

HINSCHIUS, P. ‘Das Kirchenrecht der Katholiken und Protestanten in Deutschland,’ i. (1869) 597 ff.

HIRETIUS, J. ‘Des Antiquitéz d’Anjou’ (1609).

‘Histoire littéraire de la France,’ v. (1866) 338 ff., 424 f.; vii. (1867) 53 ff., 148, 265; viii. (1868) 197 ff., 280 ff.

Höfler, C. ‘Die Deutschen Päpste,’ ii. (1839).

Honorius Augustodunensis. ‘De Luminaribus Ecclesiae sive de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis.’ M. **172**, 231 f.

Huber, J. ‘Johannes Scotus Erigena’ (1861).

Imbart de la Tours, P. ‘Les Élections episcopales dans l’Église de France du XI^{e} au XII^{e} siècle’ (1891).

Jourdain, C. ‘Dictionnaire des Sciences Philosophiques’ (A. Franck), i. (1875) 167.

‘Journal des Scavans’ (1732), 556 ff.

Kleinermanns, J. ‘Der hl. Petrus Damiani’ (1882).

Kurtz, J. H. ‘Church History,’ ii., 1889. (English translation, J. Macpherson.)

‘L.’ ‘Historische Zeitschrift,’ lix. (1888) 534 f.

*Lehmann, M. E. ‘Berengarii Turonensis vita ex fontibus haustae’ (Rostock, 1870).

Lelong, J. ‘Bibliothèque historique de la France,’ i. (1768).

Lessing, G. E. ‘Berengarius Turonensis’ (1770).

Levillain, L. ‘Le Moyen Age,’ Mai–Juin (1909), 197 ff.

Lognon, A. ‘Pouillés de la Province de Tours,’ 1903 (‘Recueil des Historiens de la France,’ iii.).

Loofs, F. ‘Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen’ (1888), 561 ff.

Lowis, D. W. ‘The History of the Church in France, 950–1000’ (1926).

Mabille, E. ‘Pancarte Noir’ (‘Mémoires de la soc. archéol. de Touraine,’ xvii., 1865).

Macdonald, A. J. ‘Lanfranc. A Study of his Life, Work and Writing’ (1926).

‘Berengar and the Virgin-Birth’ (‘The Journal of Theological Studies,’ xxx. (1929) 291 ff.).

Maffre, C. ‘Histoire Populaire des Reformateurs. I. Bérenger’ (1861).

Maître, L. ‘Les Écoles episcopales et monastiques au Occident avant les Universités’ (1924).

Manitius, M. ‘Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters,’ i. (1911); ii. (1923).

Mann, H. K. ‘The Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages,’ vi., vii. (1910).

Martens, W. ‘Gregor VII sein Leben und Wirken’ (1894).

Michael, E. (in ‘Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie,’ xviii. (1894) 525 ff.).

Milman, H. H. ‘History of Latin Christianity’ (1864), iii. 388 ff., iv. 416 ff.

Morin, F. ‘Dictionnaire de Philosophie et de Théologie scolastique,’ i. (1856) 547 ff.

Moroni, G. ‘Dizionario di Erudizione Storica Ecclesiastica,’ v. (1840) 130 f.

*Mullerus, E. ‘Berengarianisme veteris noviquehistoria’ (Rostock), 1674.

Mullinger, J. B. ‘Schools of Charles the Great’ (1877).

Neander, A. ‘General History of the Christian Religion and Church,’ vi. (English translation, J. Torrey, 1850.)

Neukirch, F. ‘Das Leben des Petrus Damiani’ (1875).

Nobilleau, P. ‘L’Archidiacre Bérenger et le Prieuré de Saint Côrme-les-Tours’ (‘Bulletin de Société archéologique de Touraine,’ iv., 1877–79).

Novati, F. ‘La Leggenda di Lanfranco da Pavia’ (‘Studii Letterari e Linguistici dedicata a Pio Ranja,’ 1911, p. 707 ff.).

Oudin, C. ‘Commentarius de Scriptoribus Ecclesiae Antiq.,’ ii. (1722) 625 ff.

Pfister, C. ‘De Fulberti Carnotensis Episcopi Vita et Operibus’ (1885).

‘Etudes sur la règne de Robert le Pieux’ (1885).

Piolin, L. P. ‘Histoire de l’Église du Mans,’ iii. (1856).

Pletteau, T. ‘L’évêque Eusèbe Bruno et Bérenger de Tours, archidiacre d’Angers’ (‘Revue historique littéraire et archéologique de l’Anjou,’ xiii. (July–August 1874) 10 ff.).

Poole, R. L. ‘Illustrations of the History of Medieval Thought and Learning’ (1920).

Porée, A. A. ‘Histoire de l’Abbaye du Bec,’ i. (1901).

Port, C. ‘Dictionnaire Historique, Géographique et Biographique de Maine-et-Loire,’ i. (1874).

Rabory, J. ‘Histoire de Marmoutier’ (‘Revue du Monde Catholique,’ April 15–August 15, 1909. Also published as ‘Histoire de Marmoutier,’ i. Paris, 1910).

Raby, F. J. E. ‘A History of Christian Latin Poetry from the beginning to the close of the Middle Ages’ (1927), pp. 238 ff., 278, 404.

Ragey, P. ‘Le Protestantisme au XI^{e} siècle’ (‘Revue du Monde Catholique,’ lvii. (1879) 544 ff.).

Rand, E. K. ‘Johannes Scottus’ (1906).

Rangeard, P. ‘Histoire de l’Université d’Angers,’ i. (1858) 17 ff.; ii. (1872) 15 ff.

Rashdall, H. ‘The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages,’ i. (1895).

Reade, W. H. V. ‘Philosophy in the Middle Ages’ (‘Camb. Med. Hist.,’ v. 780 ff.).

Reiners, J. ‘Der Nominalismus in der Frühscholastik’ (‘Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters,’ viii. Heft 5. 1910).

Rénaudin, P. ‘L’Hérésie anti-eucharistique de Bérenger’ (‘L’Université Catholique,’ xl. (1902), 415 ff.).

Reuter, H. ‘Geschichte der religiösen Aufäklrung im Mittelalter,’ i. (1875).

‘Revue Bénédictine’ (Le Messager des Fidèles), vi. (1889) 4 ff., 55 ff.; xx. (1903) 96 ff.

Rieberer, M. ‘Raccolta Ferrarese di opusculi scientifici e litterari di chi autori Italiani,’ xxi. (1789) 39 ff.

Rotier, E. ‘L’Histoire de Berengarius. Son Erreur et Pénitence’ (‘Response aux Blasphémateurs de la Saincte Masse’), 1566.

Roye, F. de. ‘Vita, Haeresis et Poenitentia Berengarii’ (1656).

Saltet, L. ‘Les Réordinations’ (1907).

Sauvage, G. M. ‘The Catholic Encyclopedia,’ ii. (1907), 487 f.

Schaff-Herzog. ‘Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge’ (S. M. Jackson), ii. (1908) 57 ff.

Schnitzer, J. ‘Berengar von Tours, sein Leben und seine Lehre’ (1890).
‘Die Gesta Romanae Ecclesiae der Kardinals Beno.’ [K. T. Heigel and H. Grauert, ‘Historische Abhandlungen aus dem Münchener Seminar,’ ii. (1892).]
*‘Der Katholik,’ ii. (Mainz, 1892) 545 ff.
Schubert, H. von. ‘Geschichte der christlichen Kirche im Frühmittelalter’ (1917-21).
Schulzen, H. E. ‘De Bertholdi et Bernoldi Chronicis’ (1867).
Schwabe, L. ‘Studien zur Geschichte des zweiten Abendmahlstreits’ (1887).
Semisch, K. ‘Eusebius Bruno Bischof von Angers’ (‘Zeitschrift für historische Theologie,’ 152 ff. Gotha, 1857).
Stäudlin, C. F. ‘Archiv für alte und neue Kirchengeschichte,’ ii. (1815) 1 ff.
Steindorff, E. L. ‘Jahrbücher des deutschen Reichs unter Heinrich III,’ Bd. ii. (1881).
Stephens, W. R. W. ‘Hildebrand and his Times’ (1903).
Urseau, C. ‘Évêques et dignitaires de l’église cathédrale d’Angers’ (‘Revue de l’Anjou,’ lvii. (1908) 417 ff.).
Uzureau, F. ‘Origine de la Fête-Dieu et des Grosses Torches à Angers’ (‘Andegavana,’ 1 Série, 1904, pp. 83 ff.; 5 Série, 1906, pp. 419 ff.).
Vaucelle, E. R. ‘La Collégiale de Saint Martin de Tours’ (‘Mems. de la Soc. archéol. de Touraine,’ xlvi., 1842).
Vergil, Polydore. ‘Historiae Anglicanae,’ Lib. ix. (Leyden, 1651).
Vernet, F. ‘Bérenger de Tours.’ Vacant and Mangenot, ‘Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique,’ ii. (1905) 722 ff.
Vernous, M. ‘Bérenger Justifié’ (Deux Traites, 1705).
Whitney, J. P. ‘Peter Damiani and Humbert’ (‘Cambridge Historical Journal,’ i. (1925) 226 ff.).
Wiegand, F. ‘Dogmengeschichte des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit’ (Evangelische-Theologische Bibliothek), 1919, p. 33 ff.
Will, C. ‘Victor II als Papst und deutscher Reichsverweser’ (‘Theologische Quartalschrift,’ 185 ff. Tübingen, 1862).
‘Die Anfänge der Restauration der Kirche im elften Jahrhundert’ (1859–64).
Winkelmann, E. ‘Die Chronik Bertholds von S. Blasien.’ G. H. Pertz, ‘Geschichtschreiber der deutschen Vorzeit,’ x. (1863).

II. Doctrinal.

(a) *Early Sources.*

Abbaud. ‘Tractatus de Fractione Corporis Christi.’ M. **166,** 1341 ff.
Abelard. ‘Theologia Christiana,’ Lib. iv. M. **178,** 1286b–c.
Adelmann. (*Cf.* Bibliography, I. (a).)
Adrevald. ‘De Corpore et Sanguine Christi contra ineptias Johannis Scoti.’ M. **124,** 947 ff.

Ælfric. 'Homilies.' B. Thorpe, 'Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church,' ii. (1840) 262 ff.
'Canons.' H. Spelman, 'Concilia,' i. (1639) 572 ff.; D. Wilkins, 'Concilia,' i. (1757) 250 ff.; M. J. Routh, 'Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum opuscula praecipua quaedeam,' ii. (1832) 519 ff.; B. Thorpe, 'Ancient Laws and Institutions,' i. (1844), 441 ff.
'A Testimonie of Antiquitie' (1566–67).
Agobard of Lyons. 'Liber adversus Amalarium.' M. **104**, 339 ff.
Ahito. 'Capitulare.' M. **105**, 763 ff.
Alcuin. 'Ep. ad Paulinum Patriarcham.' M. **100**, 202d f.
'Libri Carolini.' M. **98**, 999 ff.
Ps.-Alcuin. 'De Divinis Officiis,' C. xl. M. **101**, 1246 ff.
'Confessio Fidei.' M. **101**, 1086 ff.
Alger. 'De Sacramentis Corporis et Sanguinis Domini.' Hurter, xxiii.; M. **180**, 739 ff.
Amalry. 'De Ecclesiasticis Officiis,' iv. M. **105**, 985 ff.
Ambrose. 'De Mysteriis. M. **16**, 389 ff.
? 'De Sacramentis.' Hurter, xxxvii. 4 ff.; M. **16**, 417 ff.
Anastasius. 'Epistola ad Geraldum.' M. **149**, 433 ff.
Anonymous. 'Epistola de Sacramentis Hereticorum.' Dümmeler, 'Libelli de Lite,' iii. 12 ff.
Anselm of Canterbury. 'Epistolae,' Lib. iv. 107. M. **159**, 254 ff.
'Orationes,' 25, 26, 29, 32. M. **158**.
'Meditationes,' iv. M. **158**, 733.
'De Azymo Fermentato.' M. **158**, 541 ff.
'Responsio ad Waleranni Querelas.' M. **158**, 553.
Anselm of Laon. 'Sentences.' (*Cf.* Bliemitzrieder, *infra*, Bibliography, II. (b).)
Arnulf of Rochester. 'Epistola ad Lambertum.' D'Achery, 'Spicilegium,' iii. 470 ff.
Ascelin. (*Cf. supra*, Bibliography, I. (a).)
Atto of Vercelli. M. **134**.
Augustine. 'Contra Faustum.' J. Zycha, 'Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum,' xxv. (1891).
'Epistolae,' Pars iii. A. Goldbacher, 'C.S.E.L.,' xxxiv. (1895); xliv. (1904).
'De Civitate Dei.' E. Hoffmann, 'C.S.E.L.,' xl. Pt. i. (1898).
'In Johan Evan. Tractatus,' xxvi.–xxxii. M. **35**, 1606 ff.
'De Doctrina Christiana.' M. **34**, 15 ff.
'De Vera Religione.' M. **34**, 121 ff.
'Enarratio in Psa. xxxiii.' M. **37**, 300 ff.
'Sermo lxxi.' M. **38**, 460.
'De Catechizandis Rudibus,' 26. M. **40**, 344.
'Quaestionum in Heptateuchum,' lxxxiv. M. **34**, 712.
Bede. M. **91–95**.
Berengar. (*Cf. supra*, Bibliography, I. (a).)
Bernold of Constance. 'Micrologus.' M. **151**, 979 ff.
Bruno of Köln. 'Expos. in Psa. lxxvii.' M. **152**, 1029 ff.
'In Ep. I. ad Cor. X.–XI.' M. **153**, 171 ff.

Candidus of Fulda. ‘Opusculum de Passione Domini.’ M. **106,** 68 ff.

Charles the Great. ‘Epistolae.’ E. Dümmler, ‘M.G.H. Epistolarum,’ iv. (1895) [‘Epistolae Karolini Ævi,’ 2] 228 ff.; M. **98,** 911 ff.

Cosin, John. ‘A History of Popish Transubstantiation,’ 1676 (written *c.* 1657).

Cranmer. ‘A Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ’ (H. Wace ed., 1928).

Damiani, Peter. M. **144–146.**

Deusdedit. ‘Libellus contra Invasores et Symoniacos.’ E. Dümmler, ‘Libelli de Lite,’ ii. 328 ff.

‘Dicta cujusdam sapientis de corpore et sanguine Domini adv. Ratpertum.’ (*Cf.* ‘Ep. ad Egilem.’ M. **112,** 1510 ff., among the epistles of Rabanus Maurus.)

Druthmar, Christian. ‘Exposit. in Matt.’ M. **106,** 1476.

Durand of Troarn. M. **149,** 1375 ff.

Eusebius Bruno. (*Cf. supra*, Bibliography, I. (a).)

Ps.-Eusebius of Emesa. M. **30,** 271 ff. Ep. 38 among the epistles of Jerome.

‘Expositio Canonis Missae.’ M. **145,** 879 ff., among the works of Peter Damiani.

Fisher, Bishop John. ‘De Veritate Corporis Christi in Eucharistia adv. Oecolampadium’ (1527).

Florus of Lyons. ‘De expositione Missae.’ Hurter, xxxix. 124 ff.; M. **119,** 15 ff.

Folmar of Triefenstein. M. **194,** 1481.

Fulbert of Chartres. (*Cf. supra*, Bibliography, I. (a).)

Gerard of Cambrai. M. **142,** 1278 ff.

Gezo of Tortona. M. **137,** 369 f.; L. A. Muratori, ‘Raccolta delle Opere Minori,’ xxi. (1763) 167 ff.

Godfrey of Vendôme. ‘Tractatus de Corpore et Sanguine Domini Jesu.’ M. **157,** 211 ff.

Gregory of Bergamo. ‘Tractatus de Veritate Corporis Christi.’ Hurter, xxxix.

Guibert of Nogent. ‘Epistola de Bucella Judae data et de Veritate Corporis Domini.’ M. **156,** 527 ff.

‘De Pignoribus Sanctorum,’ Lib. ii. M. **156,** 629 ff.

Guitmund. (*Cf. supra*, Bibliography, I. (a).)

Haymo of Halberstadt. M. **117–118.**

Ps.-Haymo. ‘De Corpore et Sanguine Domini.’ M. **118,** 815 ff.

Herbert of Losinga. ‘Sermones.’ E. M. Goulburn and H. Symonds, ‘The Life, Letters and Sermons of Bishop Herbert de Losinga,’ ii. (1878).

Heriger of Lobbes. ‘Sicut ante nos.’ M. **139,** 179 ff.

Hildebert of Tours. ‘Tractatus Brevis de Sacramento Altaris.’ Hurter, xxxix. 274 ff.; M. **171,** 1149 ff.

‘Liber de Expositione Missae.’ M. **171,** 1153 ff.

Hincmar of Reims. ‘De Cavendis Vitiis.’ M. **125,** 912 ff.

Honorius Augustodunensis. ‘Eucharistion.’ M. **172,** 1249 ff.

Hooper, Bishop John. ‘Early Writings’ (S. Carr, Parker Society, 1843).

Hugh of Langres. (*Cf. supra*, Bibliography, I. (a).)

Ivo of Chartres. 'Panormia,' Lib. i. cap. 123. M. **161.**

'De Sacramento Eucharistiae et celebratione Missarum.' M. **161,** 1071 ff.

Jewel, Bishop John. 'Works' (J. Ayre, Parker Society, 1845).

Johannis Parisiensis Predicator. 'Determinatio de modo existendi Corpus Christi in Sacramento Altaris' (London, 1686).

John the Scot. M. **122.**

Jonas of Orleans. 'De Institutione Laicali.' M. **106,** 122 ff.

Jotsaud. M. **142,** 897; Mabillon, 'Acta,' vi. Pt. i., 632.

Lanfranc. (*Supra*, Bibliography, I. (a).)

Leidrad of Orleans. 'Liber de Sacramento Baptismi,' cap. ix. M. **99,** 866 ff.

Manegold of Lautenbach. 'Opusculum contra Wolfelmum.' M. **155,** 152 ff.

Maxentius of Aquileia. 'Epistola ad Carolum Magnum Imperatorem.' M. **106,** 51 ff.

Metellus, Hugh. 'Epistola ad Gerlandum.' M. **188,** 1278 ff.

Netter, T. 'Fasciculi Zizaniorum.' (*Cf.* Wyclif.)

Odo of Cambrai. 'Expositio in Canonem Missae.' M. **160,** 1053 ff.

Odo of Canterbury. M. **133,** 939 ff.

Otloh of S. Emmeran. 'Dialogus de tribus Quaestionibus,' cap. xxxiii. ff. M. **146,** 101 ff.

Peter of Blois. 'Epistola ad Petrum clericum Regis Angliae.' J. A. Giles, 'Patres Ecclesiae Anglicanae,' ii. 36 ff.; M. **207,** 416 ff.

Peter Comestor. M. **171,** 776a, among the epistles of Hildebert.

Peter Lombard. 'Sentences,' Dist. xi. Lib. iv. M. **192,** 861 ff.

Rabanus Maurus. M. **107–112.**

Radbertus Paschasius. 'De Corpore et Sanguine Domini.' M. **120,** 1267 ff.

'Epistola ad Frudegarde.' M. **120,** 1351 ff.

'Expositio in Matt. xxvi.' M. **120,** 871 ff.

Ranger of Lucca. 'Liber de Anulo et Baculo.' E. Dümmeler, 'Libelli de Lite,' ii. 517 ff.

Rather of Verona. M. **136.**

Ratramn. 'Liber de Corpore et Sanguine Domini.' M. **121,** 125 ff.

Remi of Auxerre. 'De Celebratione Missae.' M. **101,** 1246 ff., among the works of Alcuin.

'Responsio cujusdam de corpore et sanguine Domini.' D'Achery, 'Spicilegium,' i. 149 f.

Ridley, Bishop Nicholas. 'Works' (H. Christmas, Parker Society, 1841).

'Brefe Declaration of the Lordes Supper' (H. Moule, 1895).

Rupert of Deutz. 'De Divinis Officiis,' Lib. ii., C. 2, 7–15. M. **170,** 33 ff.

Ruthard of Hersfeld. Mabillon, 'Acta,' vi. Pt. ii., 138; 'Annales,' iv. 478, 527, 597.

Stephen of Beaugé. 'De Sacramento Altaris.' M. **172,** 1275 ff.

Theodulf of Orleans. 'Liber de Ordine Baptismi.' M. **105,** 239 f.

Theofrid of Echternach. ‘Flores Epitaphi Sanctorum,’ iii. and iv. M. **157**.

Walafrid Strabo. M. **114**.

William of Champeaux. ‘De Sacramentis Altaris.’ M. **163**, 1039.

Wyclif. ‘De Eucharistia Tractatus Major’ (J. Loserth, 1892).
‘Fasciculi Zizaniorum.’ T. Netter. (W. W. Shirley. Rolls Series No. 5, 1858.)
‘Trialogus’ (G. V. Lechler, 1869).
Cf. Mansi. ‘Concilia,’ xxvi. 695.

(b) *Modern Writers.*

Adam, K. ‘Die Eucharistielehre des hl. Augustin’ (1908) (‘Forschungen zur Christlichen Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte.’ Bd. viii., Heft i.).

Alzog, J. ‘Manual of Universal Church History’ (Trans. by F. J. Pabisch and T. S. Byrne, 1876), ii. 441 ff.

Amann, E. ‘Honorius Augustodunensis.’ Vacant and Mangenot, ‘Dict. de Théol. Cath.,’ vii. (1922) 139 ff.

Ampère, J. J. (*Cf. supra*, Bibliography, I. (b).)

Bach, J. ‘Die Dogmengeschichte des Mittelalters vom Christologischen Standpunkte’ (1873).

Batiffol, P. ‘L’Eucharistie’ (1905 and 1920) (‘Études d’Histoire et de la Théologie Positive,’ 2 Série).
‘Nouvelles Études Documentaires sur la sainte Eucharistie’ (‘Revue du Clergé Français’ (1908), 513 ff.).
‘Transformare’ (‘Bulletin d’ancienne littérature et de l’archéologie chrétiennes’ (1911), 54 f.).

Baumgartner, M. ‘Die Frühscholastik.’ F. Überweg, ‘Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie der patristischen und scholastischen Zeit,’ ii. (1915) 213–294.

Besse, J. ‘Hildebert de Lavardin.’ Vacant and Mangenot, ‘Dic. de Théol. Cath.,’ vi. (1920) 2466 ff.

Bliemetzrieder, F. P. ‘Anselms von Laon systematische Sentenzen’ (‘Beiträge zur Gesch. der Philos. des Mittelalters. Bd. viii., Heft 2–3. 1919).

Böhmer, H. ‘Guitmund.’ Hauck-Herzog, ‘Realencyklopädie,’ vii. (1899) 233 ff.
‘Hildebert von Lavardin.’ *Ibid.* viii. (1900) 67 ff.

Bridgett, T. E., and Thurston, H. ‘A History of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain’ (1908).

Brucker, J. ‘Historica Critica Philosophiae,’ iii. (1743); iv. (1767).

Cabrol, F. ‘Les écrits liturgiques d’Alcuin’ (‘Revue d’Histoire Ecclésiastique,’ xix. (1923) 597 ff.).

Caspari, C. P. ‘Briefe, Abhandlungen und Predigten’ (1890), 418 ff.

Dieckhoff, A. W. ‘Die evangelische Abendmahlslehre im Reformationszeitalter,’ i. (1854) 1 ff.

Dietrich, E. ‘Abbot Ælfric’ (‘Zeitschrift für historische Theologie,’ 487 ff. Gotha, 1855).

Dümmler, E. ‘Zum Heriger von Lobbes’ (‘Neues Archiv,’ xxvi. (1901) 753 ff.).

ÉBERSOLT, J. 'Revue d'Histoire des Religions,' l. (1904) 420, and *cf. supra*, Bibliography I. (b).

ENDRES, J. A. 'Honorius Augustodunensis' (1906).

'Die Dialektiker und ihre Gegner im 11. Jahrhundert' ('Görresgesellschaft Phil. Jahrbuch,' xix. (Bonn, 1906) 206 ff.).

'Petrus Damiani und die Weltliche Wissenschaft' ('Beiträge zur Gesch. der Philos. des Mittelalters. Bd. viii., Heft 3. 1910).

'Studien zur Geschichte des Frühscholastik—Berenger von Tours' ('Görresgesellschaft Philosophischer Jahrbuch,' xxvi. (1913) 260 ff.).

'Forschungen zur Geschichte der frühmittelalterlichen Philosophie' ('Beiträge zur Gesch. der Philos. des Mittelalters.' Bd. xvii., Hefte 2–3. 1915).

ERNST, J. 'Die Lehre des Hl. Paschasius Radbertus von der Eucharistie' (1896).

FALLER, O. 'Zur Echtheit von S. Ambrosii de Sacramentis' ('Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie,' 1929, p. 41 ff.).

FEHR, B. 'Die Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics' (1914).

FLOSS, H. J. 'Prœmium' to the works of John the Scot. M. 122.

GEISELMANN, J. 'Die Eucharistielehre der Frühscholastik' ('Forschungen zur Christlichen Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte,' xv.), 1926.

'Studien zur frühmittelalterlichen Abendmahlschriften' (1926).

GEM, H. 'An Anglo-Saxon Abbot' (1912).

GEYER, B. 'Die Patristische und Scholastische Philosophie' (1928). F. Überweg, 'Grundriss der Geschichte des Phil.' Tl. 2.

GHELLINCK, J. DE. 'The Sentences of Anselm of Laon' ('Irish Theological Quarterly' (1911), 427 ff.).

'Recherches de science religieuse,' ii. (1911) 466 ff.

'Note sur le premier emploi du mot "transsubstantiation"' (*Ibid.* iii. (1912) 255 ff.)

'Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique,' xiv. (1913) 347 ff.

'Dialectique et dogma au X^e–XI^e siècles' ('Beiträge zur Gesch. der Philos. des Mittelalters.' Supplement Bd. 1913).

'Le Mouvement Théologique du XII siècle' (1914).

'Eucharistie au XII^e siècle en Occident.' Vacant and Mangenot, 'Dic. de Théol. Cath.,' v. (1913) 1233 ff.

GORE, C. 'Dissertations' (1895).

'The Body of Christ' (1902).

GÖTZ, K. G. 'Die Abendmahlsfrage in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung' (1904).

GRABMANN, M. 'Die Geschichte der scholastischen Methode,' i. (1909) 219 ff.

HAMILTON, A. H. 'Medieval Doctrine to the Lateran Council of 1215' ('The Cambridge Medieval History,' vi. 1929, especially pp. 669–685.)

A. Hamilto
Thompso

HARNACK, A. 'History of Dogma,' iv. and v. (1898); vi. and vii. (1899). (Translations by J. Millar and W. McGilchrist.)

HAURÉAU, B. (*Cf. supra*, Bibliography, I. (b).)

HEURTEVENT, R. (*Cf. supra*, Bibliography, I. (b).)

HOPKINS, W. 'Betramn or Ratramn concerning the Body and Blood of the Lord' (1688).

KATTENBUSCH, F. 'Transubstantiation.' Hauck-Herzog, 'Realencyklopädie.' xx. (1908) 55 ff.

LOOFS, F. 'Leitfaden für seine Vorlesungen Dogmengeschichte' (1889).

'Abendmahl II.' Hauck-Herzog, Realencyklopädie, i. (1896) 38 ff.

MAURICE, F. D. 'Medieval Philosophy' (1857).

MORIN, G. 'La Dicta d'Heriger sur l'Eucharistie' ('Revue Bénédictine,' xxv. (1908) 1 ff.).

NÄGLE, A. 'Ratramnus und die Hl. Eucharistie' (1903).

PRANTL, C. VON. 'Geschichte der Logik im Abendland,' ii. (1885).

REUTER, H. (*Cf. supra*, Bibliography, I. (b).)

RÜCKERT, L. J. 'Das Abendmahl sein Wesen und seine Geschichte in der alten Kirche' (1856).

'Der Abendmahlstreit des Mittelalters' ('Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie' (1858), pp. 22 ff., 321 ff., 489 ff.).

SCHNITZER, J. (*Cf. supra*, Bibliography, I. (b).)

SCHRÖCKH, J. M. 'Christliche Kirchengeschichte,' xx. (1794) 158 ff.; xxiii. (1796) 437 ff.

SCHWANE, J. 'Dogmengeschichte der mittleren Zeit' (1882).

SRAWLEY, J. H. 'Eucharist.' Hastings, 'Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics,' v. (1912) 553 ff.

STEITZ, G. E. 'Die Abendmahlslehre der griechischen Kirche in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung' ('Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie,' ix.–xiii., 1864–68).

STONE, DARWELL. 'A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist' (1909).

THOMPSON, T., and SRAWLEY, J. H. 'S. Ambrose on the Mysteries and the Treatise on the Sacraments' (1919).

VACANT, A., and MANGENOT, E. 'Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique,' ii. (1905); v. (1913); vi. (1920); vii. (1922).

VERNET, F. 'Eucharistie du IX^{e} à la fin du XI^{e} siècle.' Vacant and Mangenot, v. 1209 ff.

WHITE, C. L. 'Ælfric' ('Yale Historical Studies in English,' ii., 1898).

WORKMAN, H. B. 'John Wyclif' (1926).

INDEX

Abbaud, Abbot, 388 f., 393, 398
Abelard, 312 *n.* 6, 341 *n.* 3, 400
'Accidence,' 'accidents,' 235 ; 239 and *n.* 7, 277, 296, 316 ff., 317 *n.* 3, 322, 337, 341, 344 ff., 345 *n.* 2, 365, 371, 383 f., 386, 389, 394 f., 400, 404, 407 f.
Adalard, Abbot of S. Martin's, Tours, 27, 28 *n.* 1
Adam (Scolasticus at S. Martin's), 7 *n.* 2, 24
Adam, K., 260 *n.* 1
Adelmann, Bishop of Brescia, 13 f. ; 15 and *n.* 6 ; his 'Epis. to Berengar,' 16, 49 ff., 54 ; 93 ; 121 ; 122 ; 254 ; his eucharistic teaching, 266 ff. ; 331
Adrevald, 244
Ælfric, Abbot of Eynsham, 247 ff., 247 *n.* 3, 372, 406, 409 f.
Agilbert, Archbishop of Trèves, 196
Agnes, Empress, 340
Agobard of Lyons, 243
Agobart, Bishop of Chartres, 69 *n.* 5
Agrippinus, Bishop of Carthage, 29, 165, 171
Ahito, Bishop of Basel, 230
Alberic, Cardinal-Deacon, 189 and *n.* 2, 191 f.
Albert, Abbot of Marmoutier, 24 *n.* 2, 66 *n.* 6, 72 *n.* 6, 86 and *n.* 8, 110, 112, 147
Albert, Abbot of S. Julian, 24 *n.* 2
Albigenses, 221
Alcuin, 7 ff., 22 and *nn.* 5 and 6, 23, 229 and *n.* 10, 230, 242 *n.* 7 ; Pseudo-Alcuin, 'Confessio Fidei,' 339 and *n.* 5, 340 and *n.* 1
Alexander II, Pope, 7 ; 35 ; 36 *n.* 1 ; Epis. to Eusebius, 85 and *n.* 4 ; 143 and *n.* 2 ; to Berengar, 145 and *n.* 3 ; to Bartholomew, 146 ; to Geoffrey Barbatus, 146 f. ; 150 ; 152 ; 161 ; 175 ; 194 *n.* 4 ; 217 ; 357
Alexander III, Pope, 401. (*See* Bandinelli, Roland)
Alexandria, 321
Alger of Liège, 210 *n.* 6, 293 *n.* 1 ; classifies the Berengarians, 379 f. ; grounds doctrine of Eucharist in theology, 380 f. ; his realism, 381 f. ; abandons Paschasian identification, 382 ; ubiquity of Christ's body, 382 f. ; sacramental process, 384 ; use of Augustinian terms, 385 ; influenced by Berengar, 386 ff. ; invalid Eucharists, 387 f. ; 393 ; 396
Amalric of S. Martin's, 7, 27, 28 *n.* 1, 72 *n.* 6
Amalry of Metz, 243, 280, 283
Amann, E., 389 *n.* 6
Ambrose, S., 15, 46, 51, 54, 77, 118, 186, 227, 234 f., 235 *n.* 1, 238, 244, 261, 267, 270, 283, 320 *n.* 11, 324 ff. ; 328 *n.* 12, 352, 391, 397, 403 ; Ambrosian 'De Sacramentis,, 137 *n.* 3, 259, 270 *n.* 4, 272, 325
Ambrosian realism, 233, 238, 242, 244 *n.* 1, 332 f., 339
Anastasius of Angers, 254, 271 ff., 283
Andrew, S., 335
Angers, 17 *n.* 3, 35 ff., 38 *n.* 5, 42 and *nn.* 5 and 6, 65, 221 and *n.* 6 ; (Synod 1060), 41 and *n.* 3, 133 f., 133 *n.* 3 ; (Council 1062), 136 ff., 136 *nn.* 5 and 6, 138 *n.* 2, 140 *n.* 1
Anjou, 133, 143 *n.* 5
Anne of Russia, 100 *n.* 1
Anselm of Canterbury, 4 *n.* 2, 17, 218, 291, 331, 367, 368 ff., 373, 380
Anselm of Laon, 392, 395, 399 and *nn.* 1 and 2
Ansfroi of Préaux, 66 and *n.* 4, 67, 68 *n.* 1, 69 and *n.* 6, 71 *n.* 7, 76
Anti-dialectical Conservatives, 263 ff., 289, 331 ff., 396
Archidiaconate in France, 40 *n.* 1

Archpriests, 2 and *n*. 7, 20
Arians, 166, 326, 332, 343
Aristotle, 11 f., 29, 219, 240, 271, 312 *n*. 6, 317 *n*. 1, 339 *n*. 5, 383
Arnold, Bishop of Le Mans, 148
Arnold of Lille, 25
Arnulf, Archbishop of Tours, 23 *n*. 8, 24 *n*. 2, 39, 60 *n*. 5, 86
Arnulf, Bishop of Rochester, 374 f.
Arnulf, Precentor of Chartres, 68 *n*. 3, 69 and *n*. 5, 71 and *n*. 3, 77
Arras, 48, 245
Ascelin, 16, 46, 69 and *n*. 5, 76 f.; letter to Berengar, 70 f., 78 and *n*. 2, 79, 253 f.; 81 *n*. 3, 87, 91, 331; teaching on the Eucharist, 263 ff.
Atchley, C., 270 *n*. 5
Athanasian Creed, 355, 396
Atonement, 368, 380
Atto, Cardinal, 186, 190
Atto of Vercelli, 245
Aubin, S. (Abbey), 21 *n*. 1, 37, 40
Aubrey, 6 *n*. 1
Augustine, S., 11, 15, 46, 51, 77, 87, 94 and *n*. 3, 96 ff., 117, 118, 125 f., 156, 177 f., 186, 196, 201, 237, 239, 241, 242 f., 244, 258 ff., 260 *n*. 1, 261 f., 270, 272, 283, 286, 290, 298, 324, 328 ff., 349, 352 f., 358, 386, 413 f.
Augustinian tradition. Influence on Berengar, 45, 47, 259 ff., 413; refused by Hildebrandine reformers, 196; influence in eleventh century, 213, in pre-Caroling and Caroling eras, 212 f., 227 ff., 233, 238, 246, 332, 339, on Bede, 229, Candidus of Fulda and Druthmar, 230, John the Scot, 231, Paschasius, 236 f., Ratramn, 238 f., Rabanus Maurus, 242 f., Amalry, 243, Hincmar, 244, Ælfric, 249, Lanfranc, 297 f., Otloh, 339, Guitmund, 349, on the twelfth century, 366, Guibert of Nogent, 378, Alger, 385, Godfrey of Vendôme, 392, Ridley, 411, John Cosin, 413
Autpertus (Ansbertus), 229 f.
Autun, 182
Avranches, 81 *n*. 3

BACH, J., 312 *n*. 6, 314 *n*. 6
Baldus, Bishop of Tours, 23 *n*. 8
Bandinelli, Roland, 401 and *n*. 8. (*See* Alexander III)
Baptism, 249, 268, 274, 286, 298, 326 f., 326 *n*. 11, 336, 339, 365, 374
Baronius, C., 5 *n*. 2, 110 *n*. 4, 155 *n*. 2
Bartholomew, Abbot of Marmoutier, 147
Bartholomew, Archbishop of Tours, 72 *n*. 6, 110 f., 143, 146 ff., 148 *n*. 6, 149 *n*. 1, 150 and *n*. 1, 151 and *n*. 1
Basil, S., 251 f., 260 *n*. 1, 261, 270 f., 283
Batiffol, P., 46 *n*. 1, 131 *n*. 7, 228 and *n*. 2, 231 *n*. 6, 234 and *n*. 1, 260 *n*. 1, 261 *n*. 1, 270 *n*. 4
Baudry of Bourgeuil, Bishop of Dol, 34, 209
Bec, 4, 17, 31 *n*. 1, 48 *n*. 2, 54 *n*. 4, 55 *n*. 4, 56 *n*. 2, 128 *n*. 3, 331
Bede, 15, 228 f., 244 *n*. 1, 272, 283, 347
Bellarmine, Cardinal, 330 *n*. 2
Benno, Cardinal, 191 *n*. 1, 196
Berengar, Scolasticus of Tours and Archdeacon of Angers:

The name in earlier times, 1 f.; in the Tourainegelle charters, 2 ff., 20 f.; his birthplace, 3, 5 and *n*. 2, 36 and *nn*. 2 and 3; date of birth, 5 and *n*. 2, 24 *n*. 2; his father, 6 *n*. 1; income, 6 f., 34 f., 35 *n*. 8; physical appearance, 31 *n*. 4, 209 f.; education at Chartres, 7 and *n*. 3, 10 f., 13 ff.; at Fulbert's death-bed, 17; returns to S. Martin's, 22 ff., 24 *n*. 2; Canon of S. Martin's, 25 ff., 72 *n*. 6; studies medicine, 26 and *n*. 7, 30, 32; Grammaticus and Scolasticus, 22 *n*. 4, 26 ff., 26 *n*. 6, 27 *nn*. 1 and 3, 199 and *n*. 5; Chancellor, 28; creates a famous school at Tours, 28 ff., 38; his pupils, 34 f.; his character, 31 f., 193, 208; his friends, 32 ff.

Connection with Angers, 35 ff.; Archdeacon and Treasurer, 4, 36 and *nn*. 1–3, 39 ff., 133 *n*. 4, 143, 146, 175; does not teach here, 39 *n*. 2, 42 and *n*. 6; Chancellor to Geoffrey Martel, 39

Outbreak of second eucharistic controversy, 48 ff.; case examined at Rome (1050), 61 ff.; visit to Ansfroi of Préaux, 66, 71 *n*. 7; to Brionne, 67 f., 71 *n*. 7; to Chartres, 69 ff., 71 *n*. 7; to Henry I, 68 *n*. 1, 71 ff., 116 *n*. 1; dispute with Henry I, 35, 74 ff.; condemned at Vercelli (1050), 81 ff.; guest of Eusebius at

Angers, 84, 87; charged with other heresies, 85, 88, 173 f., 173 *n.* 7, 180 f., 215 ff., 334; attacked by clergy of Chartres, 28 ff., 69 *n.* 5, 86 f., 87 *n.* 1, 99 *n.* 1, 100; correspondence with friends, 90 ff.; condemned at Tours and Paris (1051), 99 ff.; at Tours (1054), 103 ff.; no organised propaganda, 119 ff., 120 *n.* 2, 135, 153 f., 213 and *nn.* 3 and 4

Condemned at Rome (1059), 122 ff.; attitude to Hildebrand, 129; oath of 1059, 130, 357, 404, 408, 412; Synod at Angers (1060), 133 f., 133 *n.* 1; his early writings, 93, 134 and *nn.* 4 and 5, 135; political events in Anjou, 135 ff.; Council of Angers (1062), 136 ff.; attacked by Geoffrey Barbatus, 142 ff.; relations with Count Fulk, 151 ff.; attacked by Lanfranc, 155 ff.; Berengar's reply, 162 ff.

Relations with Gregory VII, 175 ff., with Philip of France, 176 ff.; condemned at Poitiers (1075), 179; in Rome (1078), 184 ff., 184 *n.* 6; writes the 'Juste Judex, Jesu Christe,' 187 f., 220; condemned at Rome (1079), 190 ff.; oath of 1079, 36 *n.* 1, 192, 344, 357 ff.; returns to Angers, 197; writes the 'Acta Concilii Romani,' 198; attacked by Fulk of Anjou, 199 and *n.* 2.

Retires to Tours, 199; correspondence with Odo of Bayeux, 199 ff.; withdraws to Côme, 201 ff., 203 *n.* 5; letter to the Hermits, 203 ff.; death and burial, 208 and *n.* 4, 209 *n.* 1; epitaphs, 209; his tomb, 209 f.; laudatory notices, 210; question of his orthodoxy, 210 ff.; influence of his teaching, 212 ff., 227, 354; supporter of Benedictine reform movement, 194 *n.* 4, 217; final estimate, 218 ff.; Berengarian legend, 220, and *n.* 2; later condemnations, 220 f.; origin of *Corpus Christi* and elevation of the Host, etc., 221 ff., 222 *n.* 9; relation of Berengar to the Reformation, 223 ff.

His eucharistic doctrine, 34 *n.* 2; its source, 46 ff., 76 f., 111 f., 234, 236, 241, 246, 250 ff.; early writings on the Eucharist, 254 ff.; his earliest critics, 263 ff.; teaching in the 'Opusculum,' 285 ff.; in the 'De Sacra Cœna,' 300 ff., quotations from Scripture, 301 f., use of dialectics, 302 ff., 305 ff., attacks Paschasius, Lanfranc, Humbert, 304 ff., 308 ff., denial of real presence, 311 f., theory of the sacrament, 312 ff., not a nominalist, 313, his symbolism, 315 ff., theory of effect of consecration and criticism of Transubstantiation, 316 ff., no theory of Consubstantiation, 323, quotations from Fathers, 324 ff.; 352; his teaching in the 'Acta Concilii Romani,' 357 ff.

Divergent estimates of his teaching, 210 ff., 210 *n.* 6, 211 *nn.* 3 and 4, 311; attitude of Damiani, 333; criticised by Lanfranc, 289 ff., by Guitmund, 341 ff., by Guibert of Nogent, 375 ff., by Alger, 380 ff., by Gregory of Bergamo, 395 ff.

His influence on the twelfth century, 364, 371, 386, 388 f., 395, 399 f., 401, 405; on the Church of England, 406 ff.

Berengar's letters:
- to Joscelin of Partenay, 33, 181 f., 201 f.
- to Lanfranc, 53 ff., 61 *n.* 8
- to Ansfroi, 76 f., 77 *nn.* 1 and 2, 253
- to Ascelin, 77, 254 f.
- to Richard, 90 f., 92 *n.* 1
- to Geoffrey Martel (?), 94 ff., 94 *n.* 3
- to Drogo, 117 f., 152 and *n.* 1
- to Adelmann, 122 and *n.* 1, 256 ff.
- to Eusebius Bruno, 137 f.
- to Cardinal Stephen, 143 f.
- to Philip I of France, 177 f.
- to Herman of Metz, 179 f.
- to Gregory VII, 182 f.
- to Odo of Bayeux, 200 f.
- to the Hermits, 10 and *n.* 4, 203 ff., 203 *n.* 6, 300

Berengar's polemical writings:
- a lost tract, 93 and *n.* 3
- the 'Opusculum,' 134 and *nn.* 4 and 5, 135 and *n.* 6, 285 ff.
- the 'De Sacra Cœna,' 10, 28 ff., 47, 58 and *n.* 1, 93, 98, 106, 122, 162 ff.; its date, 162 *n.* 1; 252, 254, 285, 300 ff.
- the 'Acta Concilii Romani,' 164, 185 *n.* 1, 198, 211, 254, 358 ff.

Berengar, Count of Bayeux, 2
Berengar, Count of Maine, 2
Berengar, Count of Rennes, 2
Berengar, Dean of Chartres, 2 *n.* 12, 3 *n.* 3, 4 *n.* 3, 21 and *n.* 1
Berengar, Dean of Holy Trinity, Vendôme, 21 *nn.* 1 and 2, 41
Berengar, Margrave of Ivrea, 1 *n.* 4
Berengar I (Emperor), 1 *n.* 4
Berengarians, 172, 213 *n.* 3, 227, 341, 350, 354 f., 363, 379 f., 398
Bernold of Constance, 93 *n.* 3, 131 *n.* 5, 161, 172 *n.* 2, 185 *n.* 1, 189 *n.* 2, 191, 208 *n.* 4, 211, 374 and *n.* 8
Bertram. *See* Ratramn
Bishop, Edmund, 27 *n.* 1, 85 *n.* 4, 145 *n.* 2, 163
Bliemetzrieder, F. P., 399 and *n.* 2
Boethius, 9, 11, 29, 312 *n.* 6
Boissonnot, H., 72 *n.* 6
Bono. *See* Bovo
Bordeaux Synod (1080), 198 f.
Bougrin, Bishop of Le Mans, 136, 140 *n.* 1, 146, 148
Bouquet, M., 108 *n.* 3, 119 *n.* 2, 136 *n.* 7
Bourges, 65 *n.* 4
Bovo, Dean of S. Maurice (Tours), 24 *n.* 2
Brice, S., 72 *n.* 6
Brionne (Council 1050), 61 *n.* 4, 67 and *nn.* 1 and 5, 68, 71, 80, 118
Brixen (Synod 1080), 196, 200, 202
Bröcking, W., 56 *n.* 3, 59 *nn.* 2 and 4, 60 *nn.* 3 and 5, 63 *n.* 3, 72 *n.* 3, 74 *n.* 3, 75 *n.* 5, 81 *n.* 2, 102 *n.* 1, 108 *n.* 1, 113 *n.* 2, 138 *n.* 2, 140 *n.* 1, 142 *n.* 1, 162 *n.* 1, 202 *n.* 1
Brookes, Bishop of Gloucester, 412
Brossier, G. M., 209 *n.* 1, 221
Brucker, P. P., 48 *n.* 2, 55 *nn.* 1 and 3, 57 *n.* 4, 59 *n.* 3, 60 *n.* 2, 66 *n.* 6, 67 *n.* 5, 72 *n.* 3, 74 *nn.* 1 and 3, 75 *nn.* 2, 3 and 5, 82 *n.* 6, 83 *n.* 2, 85 *n.* 5, 86 *nn.* 5 and 8, 88 *n.* 1, 100 *n.* 1, 109 *n.* 1, 115 *n.* 1
Bruno of Köln, 34, 367 f., 371, 376, 382

Cabrol, F., 339 *n.* 5
Caecilian, Bishop of Carthage, 29, 165, 171
Calvin, 324
Candidus of Fulda, 230 f.
Canossa, 187, 195 and *n.* 2
Canterbury, 389 *n.* 6
Capharnaites, 235 *n.* 1, 330 *n.* 2
Caroling eucharistic theory, 228 ff., 233 ff., 238 ff., 372 f.
Cassiodorus, 9, 283
Cathari, 221
Ceillier, R., 119 *n.* 2, 140 *n.* 1
Chalcidius, 11
Chalice (*and the laity*), 368 *n.* 1, 373 f., 374 *n.* 1
Champcourt, de, 209 f., 210 *n.* 1
Chancellor (*Camerarius*), 28 *n.* 3
Charles the Bald, 28 and *n.* 1, 72 *n.* 6, 91 *n.* 2, 228, 231 *n.* 7, 234, 238 and *n.* 5
Charles the Great, 7 f., 47, 101, 229 f., 246, 389 *n.* 6
Charters:
  Angevine, 3–5, 20 *n.* 2, 21 *n.* 1, 37 ff.
  Chartraine, 2, 4 *n.* 3, 20 f.
  Tourainegelle, 2 ff., 20 ff.
Chartres, 2, 4 *n.* 3, 5 *n.* 2, 7 and *n.* 3; its schools, 7 ff., 7 *n.* 3, 28, 30; 34 *n.* 7, 38 and *n.* 5, 40, 66, 68 ff., 78, 92 *n.* 3
Cheke, Sir John, 330 *n.* 2
Chemille, 94 *n.* 3, 95
Children's Eucharists, 374 f.
Chinon, 151
Chrysostom, 283, 308, 334
Cicero, 10 f., 29, 271
Clarius, Monk, 210
Clement of Alexandria, 325 *n.* 6
Clement III, Anti-Pope, 200
Clement V, 222
Clermont (Council 1094), 176, 220, 221 *n.* 1
Clerval, J. A., 7 *n.* 3, 11 and *n.* 6, 12 f., 17 *n.* 3, 18 f., 34 *n.* 7, 38 *nn.* 5 and 7, 48 *n.* 2
Côme, 202 f., 203 *nn.* 3 and 4, 209 and *n.* 1, 210
Comestor, Peter, 393
Communion, 169, 221 *n.* 1, 233, 238, 281, 373, 396
'Conficere,' 'conficitur,' etc., 287, 293, 294 *n.* 3, 320 and *n.* 10, 403
Constantine, Emperor, 29
Consubstantiation, 242, 245, 323 f., 354, 386
'Conversio,' and 'convertere,' 269 and *n.* 4, 319 f., 319 *n.* 12, 360, 402
Corbey, 234, 238, 246
Cormery, 3, 21, 25 *n.* 5, 40 *n.* 1
Corpus Christi, 221 and *nn.* 5 and 6, 222
Cosin, John, Bishop of Durham, 410, 413
Cranmer, 412

Crozals, J. de, 54 *n.* 4, 161 *n.* 3
Cuno, Cardinal, 190
Cyprian, 15, 29, 165, 178, 244, 251 *n.* 1, 260 *n.* 1, 261, 272, 324, 328, 351
Cyril of Alexandria, 269, 271, 346

Damasus I, Pope, 349 *n.* 1
Damiani, Peter, 81 *n.* 4, 104 ff., 104 *n.* 3, 106 *nn.* 7 and 9, 185 *n.* 1, 186 and *n.* 1; eucharistic teaching, 332 ff., 332 *n.* 2, 333 *nn.* 2 and 4, 358, 403
Dammann, A., 195 *n.* 2
Deanesly, Miss M., 28 *n.* 1
Delarc, O., 26 *n.* 6, 57 *n.* 3, 67 *n.* 5, 126 *n.* 2
Delisle, L., 143 *n.* 6
Delvigne, A., 54 *n.* 1
Deusdedit, Cardinal, 186, 365 f.
Dialectical realists, 173, 331, 341 ff., 380 ff.
Dialectics and the Eucharist, 173, 245, 250, 267 ff., 287, 289 ff., 303 ff., 317, 327, 331 ff., 341, 380
'Dicta Cujusdam Sapientis de Corpore et Sanguine Domini,' 241 *n.* 4, 275 *n.* 5
Dieckhoff, A. W., 235 *n.* 9, 292 *n.* 4, 409 *n.* 3
Dionysius, Bishop of Milan, 29
Dionysius the Areopagite, 11
Docetism, 361
Domnald, Bishop of Dublin, 289
Donatists, 261
Donatus the Grammarian, 18, 29
Drehman, J., 60 *n.* 5
Drogo, Archdeacon of Paris, 5 *n.* 2, 14 f., 20 *n.* 2, 30 *n.* 8, 48; letters to Berengar, 32, 92 f., 117 *n.* 5; Berengar's replies, 117 f., 117 *n.* 6, 152 and *n.* 1; 153 and *n.* 3
Druthmar, Christian, 230 f.
Dualism, 229, 242, 323
Du Boulay, 17 *n.* 3, 20 *n.* 2
Dubrueil-Chambardel, L., 11 *n.* 6, 27 *n.* 3
Ducange, 25 and *n.* 5
Dunstan, S., 247
Durand, Abbot of Troarn, 71 *n.* 7, 79, 85, 101, 111 *n.* 3, 121 f., 121 *n.* 5, 160, 172, 218; his 'De Corpore et Sanguine Domini,' 227, 245, 251, 277 ff., 293, 311 *n.* 10, 335, 362, 364, 368, 383, 392
Durand of Mende, 221

Ébersolt, J., 28 *n.* 3, 61 *n.* 4, 113 *n.* 4, 188 *n.* 1, 194 *n.* 4, 302 *n.* 3, 311 *n.* 3, 312 *n.* 6, 313 *n.* 5
Edward the Confessor, 55 *n.* 3
'Effect,' 'efficacy,' etc., 230, 240 ff., 248 f., 275 f., 286, 297, 320 ff., 334, 359 ff., 371, 414
'Efficitur,' 270, 320 *n.* 10, 372
Egilo, Epistle to, 241 *n.* 4
Elevation of the Host, 222 f., 222 *n.* 9
Endres, J. A., 11 *n.* 6, 106 *n.* 9, 169 *n.* 8, 229 *n.* 10, 289 and *n.* 3, 290 *n.* 7, 292 f., 303 *n.* 1, 308 *n.* 4, 312 *n.* 6, 333 *nn.* 2 and 4, 389 *n.* 6
'Essentia,' 'essence,' 240, 255 ff., 273 f., 296 f., 318, 324 ff., 342, 362, 371, 376, 397
'Essentialiter,' 296 and *n.* 4, 344, 366
Eugenius II, 8
Eusebius of Emesa, 234 *n.* 6, 270, 283, 324 *n.* 5. (*See* Faustus of Riez)
Eusebius Bruno, Bishop of Angers, pupil of Berengar, 34 and *n.* 3; 36 *n.* 1; 40; becomes Bishop of Angers, 49 and *n.* 6; 55 *n.* 3; protects Berengar, 56 f., 84, 87; 59 *nn.* 3 and 4; fails to get interdict removed, 60 ff.; 72 *n.* 6; checks papal action against Geoffrey Martel, 81; charged with heresy, 84 f., 88 f.; letter to Guy of Reims, 65, 75 *n.* 4, 84, 90 (*cf.* 36 *n.* 1, 57 *n.* 1, 59 *n.* 4, 60 *n.* 5); letter to Gervase of Le Mans, 83 *n.* 2, 100; 110; 112; letter to Berengar and withdrawal of support, 136 f., 138 ff., 140 *n.* 1, 141 ff., 141 *n.* 1, 151 f., 287 ff. (*cf.* 85 *n.* 5); question of his orthodoxy, 138 *n.* 2, 141 *n.* 1; 146, 288 f.; relations with Geoffrey Barbatus, 149 and *n.* 4, 150 and *nn.* 1 and 5
Eutychius, 348 *n.* 1
Evangelical tradition, etc., The, 214, 219, 220, 225, 300
'Expositio Canonis Missae,' 333 *n.* 4, 358, 402 and *n.* 1, 403

Faivre, E., 303 *n.* 3
Faller, O., 270 *n.* 5
Faustus of Riez, 234, 269 *n.* 3, 270, 324. (*See* Eusebius of Emesa)
Fehr, B., 247 *n.* 2
Ferdinand of Castile, 61 *n.* 2, 108 *n.* 3

'Figura,' 'figuraliter,' etc., 229, 236 f., 239, 243, 247 f., 258 f., 265, 271 f., 277, 279, 283, 312, 314 f., 321, 326, 328 f., 339, 349 ff., 376 f., 379, 386, 392, 397 f., 400, 403, 408, 411
Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, 412
Fliche, A., 113 *n.* 4
Florence (Council 1055), 108 *n.* 3, 119 and *n.* 3
Florus of Lyons, 243 f., 244 *n.* 2, 339 f.
Folmar, Provost of Triefenstein, 400
'Forma,' 'form,' 260, 270, 277, 286, 304, 316 f., 325 *n.* 3, 369, 376
Foxe, 410
Fraction, 375, 388
Franck, K., 83 *n.* 2, 142 *n.* 1
Frédégise, Abbot of S. Martin's, 23 and *n.* 2
Freeman, E. A., 57 *n.* 4
Frollant, Bishop of Senlis, 55 *n.* 3; letter to Berengar, 116 and *nn.* 1 and 2, 117 (*cf.* 5 *n.* 2)
Frudegarde, 237
Fulbert, Bishop of Chartres, 5 *n.* 2, 7 and *n.* 3; his work in the schools of Chartres, 8 ff., 27; date of his death, 18 f., 23, 24 *n.* 2; 48 and *n.* 5, 49, 51, 87 and *n.* 1, 91, 171; eucharistic teaching, 245 f.; 283, 324
Fulda, 337
Fulgentius, 15
Fulk the Clerk, 186, 197
Fulk Nerra, Count of Anjou, 37 *n.* 1, 38 and *n.* 6, 39 *n.* 4
Fulk Rechin, Count of Anjou, 135 and *n.* 8, 136 *n.* 7, 141 *n.* 1; attacks Geoffrey Barbatus, 150 f., 151 *n.* 5, 176; persecutes Berengar, 199

Gallic symbolism, 237, 243 and *n.* 1, 280, 291 *n.* 8, 293 f., 309, 328, 352, 377, 397
Gallicanism, 64 and *n.* 2
Gatien, S., 110 *n.* 4
Geiselmann, J., 216, 228 f., 229 *n.* 10, 236, 238 *n.* 4, 241 *nn.* 1 and 4, 243 f., 244 *n.* 2, 245 *n.* 8, 257 *n.* 1, 260 *n.* 1, 261 *n.* 2, 265 f., 269 *n.* 5, 282 *n.* 1, 284 *n.* 2, 289, 295 *n.* 1, 308 *n.* 4, 311 and *n.* 3, 316 *n.* 10, 327 *n.* 5, 333 *n.* 4, 340 and *n.* 1, 345 *n.* 2, 351 *n.* 2, 363, 388 f., 393 *n.* 4, 399 *n.* 1
Geoffrey, Bishop of Auxerre, 110 f.
Geoffrey, Bishop of Coutances, 55 *n.* 3
Geoffrey, Canon of S. Martin's, 137 and *n.* 3
Geoffrey, Dean of S. Martin's, 24 *n.* 2
Geoffrey Barbatus, Count of Anjou, 37 *n.* 1; succeeds Geoffrey Martel, 135 and *n.* 8; attacks Berengar, 136 and *n.* 7, 142 f., 143 *n.* 2, 152 *n.* 1 (*cf.* 41, 42 *n.* 5, 134 *n.* 5); 138; 141 *n.* 1; rebuked by Alexander II, 35, 146; dispute with Marmoutier and Archbishop Bartholomew, 147 ff., 148 *n.* 6; condemned by French clergy, 149 and *n.* 4; imprisoned by Count Fulk, 150 f., 150 *nn.* 1 and 9; 151 *nn.* 1 and 5
Geoffrey Martel, Count of Anjou, 37 *n.* 1; 39 *n.* 1; 40; protects Berengar, 49, 56 f., 82 *n.* 6; excommunicated at Mainz, 59 and *nn.* 3 and 4; ban not removed at Rome (1050), 60; 65; 72; 81; war with Henry I, 74 and *n.* 2, 75 and *n.* 4, 99 *n.* 1; hostility to Papacy, 84, 89 f.; holds Council of Tours (1051), 85 f. (*cf.* 53 *n.* 2); letter from Berengar, 94 *n.* 3; peace with Henry I, 101 f., 102 *n.* 1, 103, 108, 116 *n.* 1; ban removed, 102 *n.* 1, 202 *n.* 1; affairs in Anjou and Touraine, 107 f.; letter to Hildebrand, 123 ff., 123 *nn.* 1 and 2, 124 *n.* 1, 127 (*cf.* 109 *n.* 2, 110 f., 113 *n.* 4, 114 *n.* 2); death, 134 *n.* 5, 135 and *n.* 8, 147
Gerald, Abbot of S. Aubin's, 271 f.
Gerald, legate, 179 and *n.* 2
Gerard of Cambrai, 245
Gerbert, Archbishop of Reims, 8, 13, 241 *n.* 4, 245 *n.* 8
Gerland, Clerk, 400
Gervase, Bishop of Le Mans, 39, 56, 59 and *nn.* 1 and 2, 75, 81, 83 *n.* 2, 84, 86 and *n.* 4, 102 *n.* 1, 108, 110
Geyer, B., 312 *n.* 6, 399 *n.* 2
Gezo of Tortona, 244 f.
Gézon, Bishop of Liège, 81
Gfrörer, A. F., 35 *n.* 8, 55 *n.* 4, 56 *n.* 6, 61 *n.* 2, 64 and *n.* 2, 65, 66 *n.* 6, 75 *n.* 5, 82 *n.* 10, 83 *n.* 1, 85 *n.* 3, 87 *nn.* 1 and 5, 89 *n.* 3, 90 *n.* 3, 99 *n.* 1, 113 *n.* 4, 132 *n.* 2, 142 *n.* 1, 179 *n.* 1

Ghellinck, J. de, 8 *n.* 1, 293 *n.* 1, 333 *n.* 4, 393 *nn.* 1 and 3, 399 *n.* 1, 401 *nn.* 8 and 9, 402 *n.* 1, 403

Giesebrecht, W. von, 151 *n.* 5

God and the Eucharist, 233, 395 f.

Godfrey, Abbot of Vendôme, 392

Gore, Dr. C., 310, 325 *n.* 4, 330 *n.* 2, 393 *n.* 2, 395

Goulburn, E. M., and Symonds, H., 372 *n.* 2, 373 *n.* 3

Gozechin of Mainz, 52 *n.* 6, 118, 121, 153 f., 153 *nn.* 1 and 3, 252 *n.* 6, 253

Grabmann, M., 250 *n.* 1, 341 *n.* 1, 399 *n.* 1

Grammaticus, 27 *n.* 5, 28 *n.* 2

Grecie, Countess, 37 *n.* 1

Greek symbolism, 279 f., 279 *n.* 4, 312, 315, 321, 351 f., 377 f., 397

Gregory, Bishop of Bergamo, 395 ff.

Gregory, Bishop of Vercelli, 82 f., 83 *n.* 1, 167

Gregory, S., of Tours, 72 *n.* 6, 110 *n.* 4, 283

Gregory of Nazianzus, 260 *n.* 1, 261

Gregory of Nyssa, 196, 308

Gregory the Great, 15, 72 *n.* 6, 118, 156, 167, 173, 190, 202, 244 and *n.* 1, 251, 272, 324, 346; Gregorian Sacramentary, 78, 228, 263

Gregory VII, 5 *n.* 2; 35; 59 *n.* 3; 102 *n.* 1; 106 *n.* 3; 134 *n.* 5; 160; 172; elected Pope, 175; sends warning to Berengar, 176, 181; embassies to Anjou, 182 ff., 183 *n.* 3; summons Berengar to Rome, 184; holds council (1078), 184 ff., 185 *n.* 1; adjourns to Lent 1079, 189 ff.; consults the Virgin, etc., 190 ff.; condemns Berengar, 193; attitude to the controversy, 194 ff., 194 *n.* 4, 195 *n.* 1, 197 *n.* 1, 223 f.; attacked by imperialists, 187, 193, 196 f., 200; gives Berengar safe-conduct, 197; protects him against Count Fulk, 199 and *n.* 2; death, 201; 217; 357. (*See* Hildebrand)

Guanilo, Archdeacon of Tours, 24 *n.* 2

Guibert, Abbot of Nogent, 375 f., 382, 395 f.

Guilduin of Saumery, Precentor of S. Martin's, 202

Guitmund, Archbishop of Aversa, 5 *n.* 2, 10, 15, 17, 28 *n.* 4, 31 *n.* 1, 32, 47 f., 121, 159 f., 171; his career, 172 f.; 173 *n.* 7; 183; 213; 218; 227; 234; 252 f.; 305 *n.* 10; 329; 331 f.; his 'De Corporis et Sanguinis Christi Veritate in Eucharistia,' 341 ff., metabolism and use of 'substantialiter,' 342 ff., contradictions in his teaching, 344 f., 347 f., 352 f., the sacramental content, 346 ff., whole Christ in each part of Host, 348 f., integrity of sacramental body, 348 f., use of symbolism, 349 f., 'mysterium,' 350 ff., his 'Confessio,' 351, substantial union with Christ, 354, classification of Berengar's followers, 354 f., impanation, 354, invalid Eucharists, 355 f., 362, 365, 371, 379 f., 384 *n.* 3, 397, 409

Guy, Bishop of Reims, 60 *n.* 5, 61 *n.* 2, 65

Guy, Bishop of Senlis, 116 *n.* 1

Guy, Cardinal, 222

Halfmann, H., 83 *n.* 2

Halphen, L., 3 *n.* 4, 39 *n.* 4, 59 *nn.* 3 and 4, 60 *n.* 5, 85 *n.* 5, 102 *n.* 1, 138 *n.* 2, 140 *n.* 1, 142 *n.* 1, 148 *nn.* 4–6, 150 *n.* 5

Harduin, Bishop of Langres, 52 *n.* 1

Haribald of Auxerre, 241 *n.* 4

Harnack, A., 159 *n.* 11, 229, 241 *n.* 1, 304, 307 *n.* 5, 319 *n.* 12, 326 *n.* 11, 328 *n.* 12, 404, 409 *n.* 3

Hauréau, B., 11 *n.* 6, 393

Haymo, Bishop of Autun, 197 *n.* 1

Haymo, Bishop of Halberstadt, 23, 244 and *n.* 4, 275 *n.* 5, 356

Haymo, Prior of Hirschau, 356

Haymo of Telleia, 356

Héfélé, C. J. von, 235 *n.* 1

Héfélé–Leclercq, 50 *n.* 3, 88 *n.* 1, 123 *n.* 2, 130 *n.* 2

Hélinand, Bishop of Lyons, 52 *n.* 1, 55 *n.* 3, 135 *n.* 6

Henry of Knighton, 34 *n.* 7, 128 *n.* 3

Henry I of France, 11; relations with Leo IX, 55 ff., 74 f., 103, 132 *n.* 2; alleged Gallicanism, 61 *n.* 2, 64 and *n.* 2, 75 *n.* 4; Abbot of S. Martin's, Tours, 56, 72 and *n.* 6; refuses safe-conduct to Berengar, 71 ff.; imprisons and fines him, 75 f., 75 *n.* 5, 79, 82 (*cf.* 35 *n.* 8); receives letter from Theoduin, 85 ff., 100 *n.* 1; relations with Emperor Henry III, 89 f., 89 *n.* 3; war with Geoffrey

Martel, 94 *n.* 3; Council of Paris, 99 ff., 99 *n.* 1, 100 *n.* 1; makes peace with Geoffrey Martel, 101, 102 *n.* 1, 103, 107; reconciled with Berengar, 116 and *nn.* 1 and 2; death, 119 *n.* 2
Henry III, Emperor, 52 *n.* 6, 64, 75 and *n.* 1, 89 and *n.* 3, 105, 119, 153 *n.* 1, 246
Henry IV, Emperor, 132 *n.* 2, 180, 187, 195 and *n.* 1, 196, 223
Herbert of Losinga, Bishop of Norwich, 371 ff., 371 *n.* 12, 372 *n.* 6, 373 *n.* 3, 396
Heriger of Lobbes, 241 *n.* 4, 245 and *n.* 8, 250, 265, 275 *n.* 5, 391
Herman of Metz, 179 f.
Herveus, Treasurer of S. Martin's, 23, 72 *n.* 6, 202 f.
Heurtevent, R., 34 *n.* 2, 48 *n.* 2, 51 *n.* 1, 54 *n.* 4, 57 *n.* 3, 63 *n.* 1, 67 *n.* 5, 69 *n.* 5, 71 *n.* 7, 77 *n.* 2, 81 *n.* 3, 82 *n.* 2, 83 *n.* 2, 90 *n.* 3, 99 *n.* 1, 103 *n.* 2, 117 *n.* 2, 121 *n.* 5; on John the Scot and Ratramn, 231 *n.* 7, 282 *n.* 1
Hilary, 15, 29, 118, 179 ff., 270, 272, 283, 324, 347
Hildebert, Archbishop of Tours, 34 and *n.* 4, 35, 110 *n.* 4, 208 f., 392 f., 393 *nn.* 1 and 4
Hildebrand, 102; attitude to Berengar, 104 ff., 104 *n.* 3, 105 *n.* 1, 107 *n.* 2, 108, 114 f., 114 *n.* 1, 127 *n.* 3, 223 f.; Synod of Tours (1054), 108 ff., 108 *n.* 3; his policy there, 113 ff., 113 *n.* 4; summons Berengar to Rome, 122 ff., 123 *n.* 1; letter of Geoffrey Martel, 124 ff.; at Council of Rome (1059), 127 ff., 129 *n.* 6; 144; leading cardinal at Rome, 145, 157, 161 ff.; becomes Pope, 162, 162 *n.* 1, 175; 388. (*See* Gregory VII)
Hildebrand, Monk, 196 *n.* 3
Hildegaire the Physician, 13 ff.
Hildegarde, Countess, 37 *n.* 1, 136 f.
Hincmar, Archbishop of Reims, 65 *n.* 4, 244, 283
Holy Trinity, Vendôme, 21 and *n.* 1, 24 *n.* 2, 37, 39 and *n.* 1, 40, 392
Honorius of Ratisbon (or of Autun), 289 *n.* 3, 389 ff., 389 *n.* 6
Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester, 412
Hopkins, W., 249 *n.* 5
Horace, 9, 28, 335
Hormisdas, Pope, 171, 216
Hubald, brother of Berengar, 6 and *n.* 1, 22, 26 *n.* 2
Hubert, Bishop of Angers, 38 *n.* 6, 39 and *n.* 2, 40, 42 *n.* 5
Hugh, Abbot of Cluny, 147, 183 f.
Hugh, Archbishop of Besançon, 136 f.
Hugh, Archbishop of Lyons, 151
Hugh, Bishop of Die, 182 and *n.* 3, 183 and *nn.* 1 and 3, 184, 191, 198
Hugh, Bishop of Langres, 16; letter to Berengar, 51 ff., 52 and *n.* 1; 55 *n.* 3, 60; 121; 245; 254; eucharistic teaching: change of essence, 273 ff.; theory of real presence, 275 f.; mystery, 276; Christ the unit of action, 276 f.; 278; 364; 368; 383
Hugh II, Bishop of Langres, 52 f.
Hugh, Count of Maine, 107
Hugh of S. Victor, 393, 402 *n.* 1
Hugh the Cellarer of S. Martin's, 202
Hugh the Physician, 30, 203
Humbert, Cardinal, 64; 80; the reordination of bishops, 83 and *n.* 2; charges Eusebius with heresy, 84; 94 *n.* 1; chief cardinal at Rome, 104 f.; 108; secures Berengar's condemnation at Rome (1059), 127 f.; draws up the oath, 130 f., 131 *n.* 7, 284, 295, 330 and *n.* 2, 400, 412 f.; his death, 145, 155 *n.* 2, 162 *n.* 1; attacked by Berengar, 122 *n.* 1, 134 *n.* 5, 165, 169, 218, 285 f., 304 f., 308; defended by Lanfranc, 156 ff., 160; his metabolism, 273, 306, 308, 357, 365, 373, 388
Hussites, 409

IGNATIUS, 235 *n.* 1, 240, 269, 370, 397
'Imago,' 'image,' 326
Impanation, 172, 265, 354 f., 378 f., 386, 400, 409 and *n.* 3
Incarnation and the Eucharist, 244 f., 265 f., 280, 282, 322 f., 364, 366, 368, 373, 380 f., 383, 390 f., 393, 403
Ingelran, Dean of Chartres, 21 *n.* 1
Innocent I, 374
Innocent III, 225, 402 *n.* 1, 404
Intinction, 374 and *n.* 1
Invalid Eucharists, 335, 355 f., 366, 379 f., 386 ff., 391 f.
Investitures (*lay election*), 133, 147, 151, 168, 195 and *n.* 1
Irenæus, 275 *n.* 5, 323, 368
Isembert, Archbishop of Orleans, 100 and *n.* 6, 102, 110 f.

Isembert, Bishop of Poitiers, 33, 34 *n.* 1, 39
Isidore of Seville, 228, 236, 347, 351 *n.* 2
Itier, Bishop of Limoges, 83 and *n.* 2
Ivo, Dean of Chartres, 16, 92 f.
Ivo of Chartres, Canonist, 222, 370 f. 373, 374

JEROME, 15, 46, 51, 77, 118, 156, 178, 186, 244, 302, 320 *n.* 11, 346, 383
Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury, 412
Joachim, Abbot, 252 *n.* 6
John, Archbishop of Rouen, 374
John, Bishop of Avranches, 221 *n.* 6, 222
John, Monk of Marmoutier, 6 *n.* 1, 22
John, Scolasticus at Angers, 42 *n.* 6
John of Damascus, 196
John of Paris, 113 *n.* 4, 197 *n.* 1
John the Sophist (the Physician), 11 and *n.* 6
John XII, 222
John Scotus Erigena, Neo-Platonist, 11 ; not the originator of Nominalism, 11 *n.* 6, 12 ; influence on Berengar, 45 ff., 46 *n.* 1, 47 *n.* 2, 49, 56 f., 81 f., 94, 163 f., 236, 254, 302, 313 *n.* 5, 315, 323, 331 ; destruction of his writings, 84, 131 *n.* 5, 172 ; defended by Berengar, 53 f., 70 f., 77 f., 90 f., 93 *n.* 4, 94, 100 f., 167 ; influence on development of doctrine, 223, 227, 332, 382, 412 f. ; work confused with Ratramn's, 231 and *n.* 7 ; eucharistic teaching, 231 ff. ; realist criticism of his teaching, 234, 263
Jonas of Orleans, 230
Josbert, Dean of S. Martin's, 24 *n.* 2
Josbert, Monk of Marmoutier, 94 *n.* 3, 95
Joscelin, Dean of S. Maurice (Angers), 39
Joscelin of Partenay, Archbishop of Bordeaux, 33, 50 *n.* 3, 179 *n.* 2, 181 f., 199
Jotsaud, Abbot of S. Claude, 336 *n.* 4
Julian, S. (Abbey), 3 f., 27 *n.* 1, 66
Juliana of Mont Cornillon, 221 *n.* 5
Justin Martyr, 275 *n.* 5

LAMBERT, 374 f.
Landulf, Bishop of Pisa, 191 f.
Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1 ; 5 *n.* 2 ; 15 ; 29 ; 31 *n.* 1 ; 33 *n.* 2 ; 34 and *n.* 7 ; 35 ; 46 ff. ; attends lectures of Berengar, 5 *n.* 2, 49 and *n.* 4, 289 ; receives letter from Berengar, 53 ff., 54 *n.* 4, 55 *n.* 4 ; 56 *n.* 2, 58 ; at Synod of Reims (1049), 57 and *n.* 3 ; 61 *n.* 2 ; at Council of Rome (1050), 57 *n.* 4, 68 ; at Vercelli (1050), 80, 81 *n.* 1, 82 and *n.* 6, 83 *n.* 2, 160 ; 85 *n.* 5 ; 104 ; 106 ; on date of Synod of Tours (1054), 108 *n.* 3, 109 *n.* 1 ; 120 ; answered by Berengar, 122 and *n.* 1 ; 127 *n.* 4 ; account of Council of Rome (1059), 128 and *n.* 3, 129 *n.* 1, 130 *nn.* 3 and 4, 131 *n.* 4, 132, 134 *n.* 5 ; his 'De Corpore et Sanguine Domini,' 93 *n.* 3, 121, 134, 155 ff. ; its date, 155 *n.* 2, 161 ; Berengar replies in the 'De Sacra Cœna,' 163 ff. ; distrusted by Gregory VII, 186 ; 194 ; 200 f. ; 212 f. ; 215 ; 218 ; Palm Sunday procession, 222 ; destroys Berengar's 'Opusculum,' 285 ; 289 *n.* 4 ; 290 *nn.* 1 and 7 ; eucharistic teaching, 159 *n.* 11, 296 *n.* 7 ; assists development of doctrine of real presence, 234, 252, 294 ff. ; on Transubstantiation, 227, 273, 295 ff., 298 f. ; criticised by Berengar, 253, 256, 285, 287, 304 ff. ; influence of his 'De Corpore' in England, 249, 406, 409 ; qualified use of dialectics, 289, 291, 303 *n.* 2, 354 ; his statements discussed by modern logicians, 292 f., 293 *n.* 1 ; his Gallic symbolism, 280, 291 *n.* 8, 293 f., 328, 352, 377 ; his theory of 'essence,' 296 f., 346, 371 ; usage of term 'sacrament,' 297 f. ; reply of Berengar, 304 ff. ; a dialectic conservative, 331 ; 333 ; story of his boyhood, 349 ; influence of his teaching, 357, 372, 380, 397 ; 348 ; 362 ; 369 ff. ; 378 f. ; 385
Lateran Council (Fourth, 1215), 225, 300, 399, 404 ff.
Latin writers (classical), 9 ff., 22, 28 f.
Leidrad, Archbishop of Lyons, 230
Le Mans, 107
Leo the Great, 272, 283, 324, 346
Leo IX, relations with Hugh, Bishop of Langres, 51, 52 *n.* 1 ; 54 *n.* 1 ; convenes Synod of Reims (1049), 34 *n.* 1, 55 and *n.* 1, 56 and *nn.* 2, 3 and 6, 59 *n.* 1, 81 *n.* 4 ; attitude to Berengar, 57 and *nn.* 1 and 3 ; relations with

Geoffrey Martel, 59 and *n.* 3, 60, 63, 81, 102 *n.* 1, 108 *n.* 3; with Henry I, 61 *n.* 1, 74, 89 and *n.* 3; holds Council of Rome (1050), 60 ff.; relations with Henry III, 64, 75 *n.* 5; condemns Berengar at Vercelli (1050), 81 ff.; second visit to France (1050), 87; attacked by Berengar, 79, 93 and *n.* 4, 134, 167; death, 109 and *n.* 1, 113, 123; 113 *n.* 4; 119; 156 f.; 194 *n.* 4
Lessing, G., 35, 36 *n.* 1, 62 *n.* 4, 67 *n.* 1, 68 *n.* 1, 72 *n.* 6, 85 *n.* 1, 99 *n.* 1, 108 *n.* 3, 111 *n.* 3, 134 *n.* 5, 155 *n.* 2, 162 *n.* 1, 194 *n.* 4, 211 *nn.* 3 and 4
Levillain, L., 22 *n.* 6, 72 *n.* 6
Liberius (Pope), 29, 166, 171
'Libri Carolini,' 229 and *n.* 10
Lidore, S., 72 *n.* 6, 110 *n.* 4
Liège, 93, 121
Lilley, Archdeacon, 58 *n.* 1
Lisieux (Synod 1064), 143
Liutbold, Archbishop of Mainz, 52 *n.* 6, 153 *n.* 1
Logos, 233, 240, 241 *n.* 1, 275 *n.* 5, 280 f., 321, 323, 325 f., 364, 366, 368, 372 ff., 381, 389, 391, 400, 403
Lombard, Peter, 400 f.
Loofs, F., 52 *n.* 6, 53 *n.* 2, 59 *n.* 3, 60 *n.* 5, 65 *n.* 2, 72 *n.* 6, 85 *n.* 5, 102 *n.* 1, 104 *n.* 3, 105 *n.* 1, 113 *n.* 4, 123 *n.* 1, 131 *nn.* 4 and 5, 132 *n.* 1, 144 *n.* 3, 219 *n.* 4
Louis the Pious, 23
Lucian (? of Antioch), 29
Lucius of Pavia, 366
Lupus, Abbot of S. Martin's, 22
Luther, 214, 323, 330

Mabille, E., 24 *n.* 2
Mabillon, J., 22, 23 *n.* 5, 26, 28 *n.* 1, 61 *n.* 8, 67 *n.* 1, 72 *n.* 6, 90 *n.* 3, 117 *n.* 2, 119 *n.* 2, 140 *n.* 1, 155 *n.* 2, 185 *n.* 1, 189 *n.* 2, 192 *n.* 3, 363; 374 *n.* 1
Macdonald, A. J., 67 *n.* 5, 113 *n.* 4, 134 *n.* 5, 155 *n.* 2, 162 *n.* 1
Mainus, Bishop of Rennes, 83 and *n.* 2
Mainz, 59 *n.* 3, 93
Manegold of Lautenbach, 335 f.
Manichees, 245, 326, 361
Marchoard, 42
Marmoutier, 2 f., 6 and *n.* 3, 20 *n.* 2, 21 and *n.* 1, 22, 24 *n.* 2, 39 and *n.* 1, 59 *n.* 3, 72 *n.* 6; attacked by Geoffrey Barbatus, 147, 148 *n.* 6
Marriage (*clerical*), 34 and *n.* 1, 56 *n.* 3, 133
Martène and Durand, 33 *n.* 2, 34 *n.* 1, 363
Martens, W., 113 *n.* 4, 195 *n.* 1, 196 *n.* 3
Martianus Capella, 9
Martin, R. M., 399 *n.* 2
Martin, S., 72 *n.* 6, 110 *n.* 4
Martin's, S., Collegiate church at Tours, 3 ff., 21 ff., 22 *nn.* 5 and 6, 24 *n.* 2, 25 *n.* 5, 28 *n.* 1, 39, 72 *n.* 6, 148 *n.* 6, 202 f., 203 *n.* 4, 208, 209 *n.* 1
Matilda, Queen of England, 57 *n.* 4, 61, 128, 222
Matilda of Tuscany, 197 *n.* 1
Maurice, S., 72 *n.* 6, 110 *n.* 4
Maurice, S., Cathedral church at Angers, 24 *n.* 2, 38 *n.* 3, 42, 130, 209 and *n.* 1
Maurice, S., Cathedral church at Tours, 21 *n.* 9, 24 *n.* 2, 72 *n.* 6, 110 *n.* 4, 112, 148 and *nn.* 1 and 6
Maurilius, Archbishop of Rouen, 118, 119 *n.* 2, 120
Maxentius of Aquileia, 230
Melchiades, Pope, 29, 171
Merlet, R., 18 *n.*
Metabolism, 234, 236, 240, 241 *n.* 1, 244, 248, 265 f., 268, 273, 281, 296, 316, 322, 334, 346, 362. (See *Transubstantiation*)
Metellus, Hugh, 329, 400
'Mœlk, Chronicle of,' 210 f.
Morin, Dom., 241 *n.* 4, 270 *n.* 4, 374 *n.* 8
'Mystery,' μυστήριον, 229, 237 ff., 248 f., 269, 276, 287, 294, 321, 350 f., 378, 380 f., 385, 395, 397 f.

Nägle, A., 228 *n.* 4, 231 *n.* 7, 235 *n.* 1, 238 *nn.* 4 and 5, 241 *n.* 2, 330 *n.* 2, 410 *nn.* 4 and 5
'Naturaliter,' 354
Neander, 10 *n.* 4, 58 *n.* 1, 75 *n.* 5, 90 *n.* 3, 113 *n.* 4, 163
Neo-Platonism and *Neo-Platonists*, 11, 219, 231, 233, 274, 313 *n.* 5, 321 f., 332, 414. (*See* Plato)
Neukirch, F., 106 *n.* 3, 186 *n.* 1, 332 *n.* 2, 333 *n.* 2
Nicholas II, 123 and *n.* 1, 128 *n.* 3, 129, 131 *n.* 8, 132, 134 *n.* 5, 157, 164 f., 168, 194 *n.* 4, 323, 380, 412
Nobilleau, P., 209 *n.* 1, 210 *n.* 1

Nominalism, 11 f., 11 *n.* 6, 219, 312 f., 312 *n.* 6
Novati, F., 34 *n.* 7

ODA, Archbishop of Canterbury, 246 f.
Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, 199 ff., 218
Odo, Bishop of Cambrai, 364 f., 367
Odo, King of the West Franks, 72 *n.* 6
Œcolampadius, 412
Origen, 171 *n.* 3, 241 *n.* 1, 302
Orleans, 48, 100 *n.* 4, 149, 184, 245
Otloh of S. Emmeran, 336 ff.

PALLADIUS, Bishop of Heliopolis, 251
Palm Sunday, 222
Paris, 17 *n.* 3, 80; Council (1051), 50, 87 *n.* 5, 93 and *n.* 4, 94 *n.* 1, 99 ff., 99 *n.* 1, 111, 113 *n.* 4
Parker, Archbishop, 410
Paschasianism, 212, 234 ff., 244, 246, 264 f., 289, 342, 347, 359, 403, 406
Paschasius Radbert, 45 ff., 53, 77 f., 90, 105, 157, 167, 169, 194 *n.* 4, 212 f., 223; eucharistic teaching, 233 ff., novel character, 234, identifies sacramental and historical bodies, 235, creation of a new creature, 235 and *n.* 9, Isidorean symbolism, 236 f., states fact of Transubstantiation, 235 ff.; letter to Frudegarde, 237; reply of Ratramn, 238 ff., 241 *n.* 1, of Rabanus Maurus, 241 ff.; teaching criticised by Berengar, 122, 250, 253 f., 256 f., 267, 285, 304, 308, 310, 359, influence in England, 249, 372, 406; influence on Adelmar, 269, on Anastasius, 272, on Durand, 283, on Lanfranc, 299, 331; 332; 348, 359; twelfth-century reaction, 377, 382, 385
'Patrick, Epistle to,' 245 *n.* 5, 398
Paulinus, Precentor of Metz, 50; correspondence with Berengar, 93 and *nn.* 3 and 4, 94 and *nn.* 1 and 3, 97, 99; 134
Pavia, 1, 61, 290
Pelagius, 196, 217
Perenesius, Abbot of Redon, 83 and *n.* 2
Perpet, S., 72 *n.* 6
Peter of Blois, Archdeacon of Bath, 403 f., 403 *n.* 4
Peter the Roman Deacon and Chancellor, 81 and *n.* 4, 167, 186
Peter the Venerable, Abbot of Cluny, 310 *n.* 6, 379 f.
Peter Comestor. *See* Comestor
Peter Damiani. *See* Damiani
Peter Lombard. *See* Lombard
Petrobrusiani, 221
Pfister, C., 18 *n.*, 34 *n.* 7
Philip I of France, 151 and *n.* 3, 176 ff., 179 *n.* 1, 215, 218
'Pignus,' 'pledge,' 236, 248 f., 267, 321
Placentia (Synod 1095), 220
Plato and *Platonism*, 11 f., 29, 166, 196, 240, 323, 329, 342
Pletteau, T., 31 *n.* 1, 42 *n.* 5, 101 *n.* 3, 133 *n.* 4, 141 *n.* 1, 145 *n.* 3, 146 *n.* 1, 271 *n.* 1
Poitiers, 87, 91; Synod (1076), 179 and *n.* 2, 181
Popa, wife of Rollo of Normandy, 2
Porée, A. A., 5 *n.* 2
'Portiuncula,' 308 f., 347
Prantl, C. von, 11 *n.* 6, 292, 308 *n.* 4, 312 *n.* 6
Préaux, 66 f., 80
Prebends of S. Martin's, Tours, 25 f., 25 *n.* 5, 27 f.
Primacy, 65 *n.* 4

QUIRIACUS II, Bishop of Nantes, 136, 143 f., 146 *n.* 6, 182 *n.* 1

RABANUS MAURUS, 15, 23, 236; eucharistic teaching, 241 ff., 241 *n.* 4, 243
Radbert. *See* Paschasius
Radulf, Archbishop of Tours, 151, 176, 199
Radulf, Dean of S. Martin's, 26 *n.* 8
Ragey, P., 36 *n.* 3
Rahard, Provost of Orleans, 143 f., 146 *n.* 6
Rangeard, P., 6 *n.* 1, 38 *n.* 7, 41 *n.* 4
Ranger, Bishop of Lucca, 370
Rather, Bishop of Verona, 398
Ratramn, influence on Berengar, 45 f., 54, 250, 254, 287, 331; his book confused with work of John the Scot, 81 *n.* 3, 231 *n.* 7, 263; 213; 215 f.; 223; 227; 236; eucharistic teaching, 238 ff., criticism of realism, 238 f., dynamic symbolism, 239 f., on real presence and Transubstantiation, 240 f., 241 *n.* 1, 287, 321;

influence in England, 248 and *n.* 6, 249 and *n.* 5, 406, 410 ff.; 266; 269; 332; 400
Reade, W. H. V., 312 *n.* 6, 314 *n.* 4
Realism and *Realists*, 229; theory of Paschasius, 236; 244 and *n.* 1; influence of Paschasian realism, 246, 250; 255; criticised by Berengar, 257, 308, 329, 361 f.; 263; its physiological problem, 275; synthesis with symbolism, 245, 279, 349 ff., 378; 284; Lanfranc's theory, 295; anti-dialectic realists, 332 ff., 334; Guitmund's theory, 341 ff.; twelfth-century realism, 364 ff.; 386; 388; 394; 396; criticised by Wyclif, 407 ff.; 413
Reformation, The, 45 *n.* 2, 224, 235 *n.* 9, 406, 410 *n.* 5, 414
Reginald, Abbot of Bourgeuil, 90 *n.* 3, 117 *n.* 2
Reginald, Abbot of Poitiers, 180
Reginald, Sub-Master at S. Martin's, 7 *n.* 2, 24
Reims (Synod 1049), 51, 55 and *nn.* 1 and 3, 56 *n.* 2, 57 and *n.* 3, 59, 74, 75 *n.* 2, 81 *n.* 4, 89
Reiners, J., 312 *n.* 6
Remi, Bishop of Auxerre, 244 and *n.* 4, 275 *n.* 5
Remiremont, 57 *n.* 3
Renaud, Archdeacon of Angers, 10, 37 *n.* 1, 39 and *n.* 1, 42 *n.* 6, 123 *n.* 2
Renaud, Scolasticus of S. Julian's, 27 *n.* 1
Rénaudin, P., 49 *n.* 6
Reordination, 83 and *n.* 2, 167
'Res,' 'res sacramenti,' 258, 286, 299, 314, 321, 323, 359 f., 364, 378, 385 f., 392, 397 f.
'Responsio Cujusdam de Corpore et Sanguine Domini,' 245
Reuter, H., 103 *n.* 3, 120 *n.* 2, 195 *n.* 1, 254, 304
Richard, Cardinal, 46, 90 f., 90 *n.* 3, 117 *n.* 2, 183
Richard of Poitiers, 210
Richer, Abbot of S. Julian, 66 and *n.* 4, 68
Ridley, Bishop of London, 410 ff.
Rieberer, M., 185 *n.* 1, 189 *n.* 2
Robert the Pious, King of France, 23, 24 and *n.* 2, 74
Robert the Strong, Duke of the French, 72, *n.* 6
Rollo of Normandy, 2
Rome Council (1050), 50 f., 59 ff., 59 *n.* 4, 60 *nn.* 1, 2 and 5, 61 *n.* 8, 83 *n.* 2, 99 f., 108, 122 *n.* 1, 380 *n.* 4; (1051), 83 *n.* 1; (1059), 93 *n.* 3, 102, 116 ff., 123 *n.* 1, 128 *n.* 3, 284 f., 291, 380, 404, 412; (1078), 183 ff., 184 *n.* 6, 185 *n.* 1, 189 and *n.* 2; (1079), 185 *n.* 1, 189 and *n.* 2, 190 ff., 194 *n.* 4, 380 *n.* 4, 403 f.
Ronceray d'Angers (Abbey), 37, 38 and *n.* 3
Roscelin, 11 *n.* 6, 312 *n.* 6
Rotier, E., 412
Rouen (Synod 1055), 118, 119 *n.* 2, 121 *n.* 5, 143; (Synod 1063), 119 *n.* 2, 143
Rückert, L. J., 216 *n.* 6, 229, 241 *n.* 1, 242 *n.* 7, 243 f., 253 *n.* 6, 311 *n.* 3, 325 *n.* 4
Rufinus, 283
Rupert of Deutz, 399 f.
Ruthard, Abbot of Corvey, 336 *n.* 4

SALERNO, 14, 197 *n.* 1
Saltet, L., 83 *n.* 2
Saumur (Synod 1067), 150
Saviour, S. (Abbey), 136
Schmid, C. A., 122 *n.* 1, 163
Schnitzer, J., 28 *n.* 3, 53, 54 *n.* 4, 58, 83 *n.* 1, 94 *n.* 3, 96 *n.* 2, 100 *n.* 4, 102 *n.* 1, 103 *n.* 3, 113 *n.* 4, 116 *n.* 1, 123 *n.* 2, 124 *n.* 1, 128 *n.* 3, 130 *n.* 2, 131 *n.* 4, 133 *n.* 4, 134 *n.* 5, 136 *nn.* 1 and 7, 140 *n.* 1, 141 *n.* 1, 159 *n.* 11, 160 *n.* 2, 162 *n.* 1, 164 *n.* 4, 173 *n.* 7, 182 *n.* 1, 183 *n.* 3, 185 *n.* 1, 189 *n.* 2, 191 *n.* 1, 194 *n.* 4, 199 *n.* 2, 214 *n.* 1, 216, 231 *n.* 7, 239 *n.* 7, 241 *n.* 1, 252 *n.* 6, 266, 284 *n.* 4, 289, 296 *n.* 7, 304 *n.* 1, 311 *n.* 3, 317 *n.* 3, 323 *n.* 5, 348 *n.* 8, 393 *n.* 1
Schools: Royal School of the Palace, 7, 22; cathedral and monastic schools, 7 f., 9 *n.* 1; primary schools, 8; at Chartres, 8 ff., 28; at Reims, 8, 13; at S. Martin's, Tours, 7, 22 ff., 27 ff., 38
Schröckh, J. M., 99 *n.* 1, 113 *n.* 4, 269 *n.* 5
Schwabe, L., 3 and *n.* 6, 4 *n.* 3, 5 *n.* 2, 24 *n.* 2, 28 *n.* 3, 35 *n.* 8, 36 *n.* 2, 41 *n.* 3, 52 and *nn.* 1 and 6, 54 *n.* 2, 57 *nn.* 1 and 3, 59 *nn.* 2 and 3, 60 *n.* 5, 62 *n.* 4, 63 *n.* 3, 65 *n.* 2, 67 *nn.* 1 and 5, 68 *n.* 3, 69 *nn.* 5 and 6, 72 *nn.* 4 and 6,

75 *n.* 4, 77 *nn.* 1 and 2, 81 *nn.* 1 and 5, 87 *n.* 5, 88 *n.* 1, 93 *n.* 3, 94 *nn.* 1 and 3, 99 *n.* 1, 102 *n.* 1, 103 *n.* 3, 106 *nn.* 7 and 8, 107 *n.* 2, 113 *nn.* 2 and 4, 114 *n.* 1, 124 *n.* 1, 127 *n.* 3, 128 *nn.* 2 and 3, 130 *n.* 4, 131 *nn.* 4 and 5, 134 *n.* 5, 138 *n.* 2, 140 *n.* 1, 142 *n.* 1, 145 *nn.* 1 and 3, 146 *n.* 6, 149 *n.* 4, 151 *n.* 5, 153 *n.* 1, 155 *n.* 2, 161 *n.* 5, 162 *n.* 1, 164 and *n.* 6, 183 *n.* 3, 184 *n.* 6, 189 *n.* 2, 195 *n.* 1, 202 *n.* 1, 273
Scolasticism, 11, 219 *n.* 4. (See *Nominalism*)
Scolasticus, 27 *n.* 5, 28 *n.* 1
Scotus Erigena. *See* John Scotus Erigena
Semisch, K., 85 *n.* 5, 138 *n.* 2, 140 *n.* 1
'Sensibiliter,' 394 and *n.* 8
'Sensualiter,' 256, 257 *n.* 2, 258 *n.* 2, 261 *n.* 2, 284, 358
Siegbert of Gembloux, 290
'Signum,' 'sign,' 229 f., 236, 243, 260 *n.* 4, 261, 283, 286 f., 329, 349 f., 356, 358, 360 f., 371, 375, 385, 392, 408, 413
Sigon (painter and musician), 14 f., 18 f.
Sigon of Saumur, 13 f.
'Similitudo,' 'similitude,' 236, 243, 277 f., 286 f., 293 f., 297, 315, 328, 352, 386, 397, 411
Simony, 56 *n.* 3, 83 and *n.* 2, 105, 108 *n.* 3, 133, 151 and *n.* 5
Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, 235 *n.* 1
Soteriology, 349 f., 361, 368, 380, 390 f.
'Species,' 270, 277, 283, 286 f., 293, 297, 316, 318, 328, 365, 367, 369, 371, 376, 378, 385, 392, 402
Stäudlin, C. F., 47 *n.* 4, 55 *n.* 4, 72 *n.* 6, 75 *n.* 5, 113 *n.* 4, 142 *n.* 1, 185 *n.* 1
Steindorff, E. L., 52 *n.* 1, 88 *n.* 2
Steitz, G. E., 235 *n.* 1
Stephen, Cardinal, 6, 133, 143 ff., 150
Stephen of Beaugé, Bishop of Autun, 389, 391, 401 and *n.* 7
Stephen of Pavia, 82 *n.* 2
Stephen IX, 119, 123 *n.* 1
Stercoristan, 310, 330 *n.* 2
Stone, Darwell, 49 *n.* 3, 231 *n.* 5, 240 *n.* 9, 260 *n.* 1, 371 *n.* 12, 393 *n.* 1
'Substantia,' 'substance,' 235, 240, 256, 265, 277, 279, 371, 383 f., 394, 400
'Substantialiter,' 173, 192, 194 *n.* 4, 281 and *n.* 4, 342, 344, 354, 356 f., 358 f., 361 f., 382 and *n.* 1, 391, 397 and *n.* 3, 409
Sudendorf, H., 5 *n.* 2, 33 *n.* 2, 34 *n.* 1, 57 *n.* 1, 67 *n.* 4, 68 *n.* 3, 69 *n.* 6, 71 *n.* 7, 72 *n.* 6, 75 *n.* 5, 77 *n.* 2, 78 *n.* 3, 81 *nn.* 1 and 4, 85 *n.* 5, 91 *n.* 4, 92 *n.* 3, 93 *n.* 4, 94 *n.* 3, 109 *n.* 2, 112 *n.* 4, 113 *n.* 4, 116 *nn.* 1 and 2, 117 *n.* 6, 121 *n.* 5, 122 *nn.* 1 and 2, 126 *n.* 1, 135 *n.* 8, 136 *n.* 5, 137 *n.* 2, 140 *n.* 1, 141 *n.* 1, 153 *nn.* 1 and 3, 183 *nn.* 1 and 3, 199 *n.* 2
Sulpicius, Treasurer of S. Martin's, 23 and *n.* 8
Summarists. See *Systematists*
Sutton, John, 412
Symbolism, Dynamic, in Caroling era, 230, 233, 236 f., 238 f., 242, 243 ff., 246; in England, 248 f.; in Berengar's teaching, 255, 259, 261, 315 f., 321, 354, 358, 413; anti-dialectic conservatives, 267, 271, 278 ff., 334, 338; dialectical conservatives, 293 f., 305, 349 ff.; in twelfth century, 369, 376 ff., 386, 398; in Wyclif's teaching, 407; English Reformers, 410 ff. (See *Augustinian tradition*)
Systematists, 399 ff.

Tarsitius the Martyr, 349
Temple, Dr., 315
Tertullian, 261
'Testimonie of Antiquity, A,' 410
Theoduin of Liège, 85, 88 ff., 88 *n.* 1, 99 *n.* 1, 100, 121, 215, 254; eucharistic teaching, 269 ff., 339
Theodulf, Bishop of Orleans, 8, 230
Theofrid, Abbot of Echternach, 362 f.
Thierry, Bishop of Chartres, 39, 40 *n.* 1
Thomas, Archbishop of York, 61, 161, 193
Thomas Aquinas, 399, 404, 407
'Three Rare Monuments of Antiquitie,' 410
Tours, 1, 22 ff., 27 ff., 38, 143 *n.* 5, 331; (Synod 1051), 53 *n.* 2, 67 *n.* 5, 85 f., 85 *n.* 5, 103; (Synod 1054), 101 *n.* 1, 102 and *n.* 1, 103 ff., 103 *n.* 2, 108 *n* 3, 116 *n.* 2, 118, 120, 121 *n.* 5, 157, 167 f.; (Synod 1055), 108 *n.* 3; (Synod 1060), 41 *n.* 3, 133 *n.* 3, 143 *n.* 10

'Transubstantiare,' 393, 401 and *nn.* 6 and 9, 402 and *nn.* 5 and 7
'Transubstantiatio,' 358, 392, 401 and *nn.* 8 and 9, 403 and *n.* 1
Transubstantiation, 211; development of theory, 227, 237 *n.* 4, 238 *n.* 4, 280 f., 284, 295 ff., 342, 347, 364, 383, 401 ff.; denied by Berengar, 330, 358 f., 362 f.; 354; use of doctrine in twelfth century, 369, 371, 375 f., 378, 384, 386, 391, 395, 401 ff.; official decree, 225, 300, 404 f.; denied in England, 406 f., 411, 413; retained by Hussites, 409
Trent, Council, 404 f.
Trinity, 354, 375, 376 f., 390, 396, 404
'Trope,' and 'tropical,' 305, 321, 408
'Typus,' and 'type,' 280, 283, 313

ULGER, Dean of S. Martin's, 22 *n.* 4, 23 and *n.* 7, 24 *n.* 2, 25 *n.* 5
Ulric, Bishop of Padua, 185 *n.* 1, 191 f.
Unleavened bread, 369, 386
Urban II, 151, 172, 176, 366
Urban IV, 221 and *n.* 5, 222

Value, 239, 241, 245, 257, 259, 262, 286, 315, 320 ff., 359, 361, 411, 413 f.
Vaucelle, E. R., 22 *n.* 6, 24 *n.* 2, 27 *n.* 3, 28 *n.* 1, 72 *n.* 6
Vercelli, 50 f., 59, 66 *n.* 5, 67 *n.* 5, 69, 71 f., 77 *n.* 2, 79, 81 *n.* 2, 82 *n.* 6, 89 f., 93 *n.* 4, 99 *n.* 1, 100, 116 *n.* 1; Council (1050), 47, 80 ff., 80 *n.* 3, 81 *n.* 3, 83 *nn.* 1 and 2, 91, 93, 108, 231 *n.* 7
Vernet, F., 34 *n.* 7, 223
Victor II, 102 *n.* 1, 108 *n.* 3, 109 *n.* 1, 119 and *n.* 2, 123 *n.* 1, 157, 167 f.
Vienne Council (1311), 222
'Virtue,' 230, 240, 242, 358, 360 f., 398, 403, 407, 413
Vischer, A. F. and F. Th., 163 and *n.* 4
Vivian, Count, 72 *n.* 6

WALAFRID STRABO, 242 f.
Waldenses, 221
Walter, Abbot of S. Aubin's, 86, 110, 112, 113 *n.* 4, 126
Walter, Precentor of S. Martin's, 6, 22 *n.* 4, 23, 24 ff., 25 *n.* 3, 35 f.
Walter of S. Victor, 400
Westphalia, 224
Will, C., 52 *n.* 1, 72 *n.* 1, 99 *n.* 1, 108 *n.* 3, 113 *n.* 4, 164 *n.* 6
William, Provost of Chartres, 68 *n.* 3, 69 and *nn.* 2 and 5, 70 f., 78
William, Treasurer of S. Martin's, 92 and *n.* 1
William of Champeaux, 373 f., 399 *n.* 1
William of Malmesbury, 17, 210
William of Normandy, 55, 57 *n.* 4, 61 and *nn.* 2 and 4, 62, 64 and *n.* 2, 66 *n.* 6; holds Council of Brionne, 67 and *n.* 5, 68 and *n.* 1; 72, 74 *n.* 3, 99 *n.* 1, 107, 119 *n.* 2, 128, 148 and *n.* 4, 172
William of S. Thierry, 400
Wipert, Archbishop of Ravenna. *See* Clement III
Wolfelm, Abbot of Brauweiler, 173 f., 173 *n.* 7, 254, 334 ff.
Wolfenbüttel, 163
Workman, Dr., 406 *n.* 2, 407 *n.* 5
Wulfstan, Archbishop of York, 247 f.
Wulfstan, Bishop of Worcester, 249
Wulsige, Bishop of Sherborne, 247
Wyclif, 406 ff., 406 *n.* 2, 407 *n.* 5

YOUNG, Archbishop of York, 410

ZWINGLIANISM (*Memorialism*), 278 and *n.* 2, 315, 321, 324, 411

Printed in England at THE BALLANTYNE PRESS
SPOTTISWOODE, BALLANTYNE & CO. LTD.
Colchester, London & Eton

Date Due

Fac -
OCT 19 1982
NOV 26 1984
DEC 12 1984
NOV 24 1986
DEC 15 1986
DEC 4 1987
DEC 16 1989
DC 12 '98

CENTRAL BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
0 0021 0009559 1

922.244
B488
M135

AUTHOR Macdonald, Allan John Macdonald.

TITLE Berengar and the reform of sacramental doctrine.

43981

Date Due	Borrower's Name
Fac	R. G. Torbet
OCT 1 9 1982	Michael Taflin
NOV 1 1982	Pat Herrera 11-11-82
NOV 2 6 198	Bob Wilson
DEC 1 2 198	Bob Wilson

922.244
B488
M135

Macdonald, Allan John
Macdonald.
Berengar and the reform
of sacramental doctrine.

43981